THE

Rebuffer rebuffed;

OR,

A VINDICATION

OF THE

REMARKS on the Second Part of Principles political and religious, and of ſeveral MS. Letters ſent to the Reverend Mr Sieveright, *anno* 1767.

In anſwer to that Gentleman's Exceptions in his Pamphlet, intitled, *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, N° 1. *a Rebuff*.

He that is firſt in his own cauſe, ſeemeth juſt, *but his neighbour cometh and ſearcheth him.* Prov. xviii. 17.

Parturient montes, naſcetur ridiculus mus. Hor. Ar. Poet.

EDINBURGH:

Printed and ſold by WILSON ROBERTSON & TENNENT, at their Printing Houſe in Conn's Cloſe, Cowgate.

M DCC LXX.

1608/2293.

The Rebuffer rebuffed, &c.

ALTHOUGH the letters from Aberdeen and Edinburgh, publiſhed in anſwer to the Rebuffer's former performance, contain a ſufficient reply to what he has urged in this his ſecond eſſay, becauſe he has neither removed the objections which were made to his own ſyſtem, nor confuted the arguments that were employed in ſupport of his antagoniſts; yet, as there are ſome well-meaning, but weak people, who may be impoſed upon by words which have no ſignificancy, I ſhall therefore endeavour to lay open, in this vindication, the fallacy of the reaſoning contained in the Rebuff, and alſo ſhall confirm more fully what has been already advanced in defence of the Epiſcopal church of Scotland. But before I begin, let me advertiſe the reader, that it is no part of my plan to meddle with the Rebuffer's political principles, any farther than to point out a few of his abſurdities and contradictions; far leſs do I mean to attack the Revolution, and the ſettlements conſequent thereupon. And therefore, if I have occaſion to impugn the doctrine of reſiſtance, the candid reader will obſerve, that I argue upon my adverſary's conceſſions, in order to expoſe more effectually the fallacy of his reaſonings againſt the church of Scotland.

I muſt alſo advertiſe the reader, that this reverend author hath given a moſt partial, and therefore very unfair repreſentation of his neighbour's cauſe, which I apprehend is no great ſign of the goodneſs of his own. The Rebuffer (p. 54.) acknowledges, that more than one of his friend's letters came to his hand (and he might have owned three or four, all upon the ſame ſubject, and explanatory one of another). He muſt confeſs too, that he was informed, in one of theſe letters, that the author would probably print the ſubſtance of them, with ſuch additions and alterations as ſhould afterwards occur to him. And it can be proved, if denied, by a letter under his own hand, that he had ſeen that ſmall pamphlet, long before the appearance of his Rebuff. Now, ſurely, if this gentleman had meant either to do juſtice to his readers, or deal fairly by his antagoniſt, he would at leaſt have printed the whole of his letters relative to the ſame ſubject: or rather, would have attempted to anſwer his *printed pamphlet*, becauſe that was poſterior to the letters, contained the author's laſt thoughts, and had ſome material additions and alterations

which were not in the letters. The Remarker alſo juſtly may complain of the *manner* in which he has printed even that ſingle letter, namely, of his throwing in between the ſeveral parts of it, many reflections of his own, in long periods, whereby the thread and connection of the different arguments are in a great meaſure loſt, and the ſtrength of the whole conſiderably impaired, unleſs more attention be given, than is uſually done by the common run of readers. I ſhall make no obſervation upon this uncommon procedure; but leave the reader to judge of my adverſary's candor, and to determine what credit is due to ſuch pretended vouchers as paſs through his hands.

The Rebuffer has been pleaſed to complain of freedoms being uſed with him, and particularly, that he has been repreſented as a firebrand and an ignoramus: but when the reader is told, that without the leaſt provocation he had revived a moſt infamous calumny againſt the late Dr Rattray of Craighall, one of the beſt men, and one of the firſt gentlemen in the kingdom; a gentleman, who might have diſdained to have ſet him or his father with the dogs of his flocks: and that, not content with that piece of malice, he accuſed many worthy clergymen, now alive, of ſuch horrible practices, that, to uſe his own phraſe, "no pious and well-"diſpoſed Chriſtian can put up with them, or live in their fel-"lowſhip:" And, to crown all, that, with a virulence peculiar to himſelf, and in the true ſtyle of an informer, he had attempted to ſet up a few Chriſtian brethren, ſufferers for conſcience ſake, as ſo many marks to be ſhot at, or rather as ſo many wild bears to be torn in pieces, by repreſenting their numbers and their principles as dangerous to the government: Nay, that he deſcribes them as "all rendered giddy by the prejudice of a heated imagination, "induſtriouſly, though vainly, converted into a profeſſed actuating "principle of conſcience," *Prin. pol. et rel.* p. 1. *&c.* And, what is ſtill perhaps more amazing than all, that though he reſents highly the indignity of being ſuppoſed ignorant himſelf, yet he applied that *very epithet*, and one much worſe, I mean groſs *perverſeneſs*, to the whole body of Nonjurors, *ibid.* p. 145. I ſay, let all this be conſidered, and then let the modeſty and juſtice of the Rebuffer's complaint be ſubmitted to the reader.

Theſe things being premiſed, I come now to conſider the merits of this *mighty* man's Rebuff. I call him a *mighty man*, becauſe ſuch it is plain he would have us believe him to be: for though he has told us that he has but two adverſaries, yet he not obſcurely inſinuates, that he could eaſily vanquiſh two hundred, if there were ſo many. And ſurely he muſt be a *mighty man* indeed, that can at once aſſail, and conquer too, two hundred enemies. Let us try then what this modern Goliah has done, this bold reviler of one of the pureſt churches on earth, and

therefore

therefore haughty defier of the army of the living God. And to begin with the caſe of Abiathar, (ſig. 5. p. 45.) But previouſly the reader will pleaſe to call to mind, that the author of the Remarks on the ſecond part of the Rebuffer's firſt performance, (p. 5, 6, 7, 8.) had objected to the caſe of Abiathar, as an improper defence of the deprivations at the Revolution, for the following reaſons.

1*ſt*, That by the gentleman's own confeſſion, it was a ſingle inſtance, and therefore too ſlender a foundation to build a doctrine upon, which includes in it the enormous power of diveſting the Chriſtian church of all her lawful governors.

2*dly*, That Abiathar, not being the repreſentative of the eldeſt ſon of Aaron, and ſo not the lineal and hereditary high prieſt, might lawfully be diſpoſſeſſed for the eſtabliſhment of Zadok the true heir of the Aaronick family.

3*dly*, That Solomon was a prophet, and as ſuch might exerciſe authority over the Jewiſh prieſts, which no king who is not a prophet, can exerciſe over the miniſters of the goſpel. And,

4*thly*, That he had a particular and extraordinary commiſſion from his father by direction of the Spirit of God, for ordering the courſes of the prieſts: whereas King William could not, nor can any monarch now on earth produce ſo clear a charter for giving authority to, or taking ſpiritual juriſdiction away from Chriſtian biſhops.

And now what does our redoubtable hero oppoſe to all this? why, he entirely overlooks the conſideration of its being a ſingle caſe; nor does he take the leaſt notice of Solomon's extraordinary commiſſion for ordering the courſes of the prieſts: but, as if both theſe were nothing to the purpoſe, he barely replies in theſe words, (ſig. 5. p. 45.) "Upon the ſuppoſition made, that King "Solomon, as a prophet, had authority from God for depriving "Abiathar of his ſacerdotal office or prieſthood, it will follow, "that *all other kings* may lawfully treat in the ſame manner all "diſobedient churchmen; for this plain reaſon, if God by his "immediate authority directed the civil magiſtrate to puniſh "with deprivation a diſobedient churchman, it thence follows for "certain, that all civil magiſtrates may be ſure they do what is "acceptable in the ſight of God, when *they* deprive diſobedient "churchmen. So I owe my friend thanks for giving me this "argument." And much good may this argument do his friend. The vindicator however believes, that before he has done with it, thoſe who the Rebuffer reckons to be *really* his friends, will not thank him much for making uſe of it. What then, I pray you, is the Rebuffer's argument? Why, that what Solomon did as a *prophet*, and by *God's immediate* authority, to Abiathar, the ſame all *other* kings, although not *prophets*, nor acting by *immediate* authority,

authority, may do to biſhops under the goſpel: becauſe God's giving *immediate authority* (and, I may add, an extraordinary commiſſion) to the former, to deprive, in one particular caſe, without which he could not lawfully have done it, *is a ſure proof* that the latter *do well* when they deprive all other diſobedient churchmen for the like crimes *in all caſes?* And is this really ſo? Ye powers of logic! if this be reaſoning, what is N——? Was King William a prophet or a prophet's ſon? Or did he deprive the Scotch biſhops by immediate authority from Almighty God? I never heard that he was the one, or that he pretended to the other. And if not, does it follow, as the Rebuffer argues, that he had the ſame power over the Scotch biſhops, which Solomon exerciſed, as a prophet, and by virtue of an extraordinary commiſſion, over Abiathar one of the prieſts of the law? I apprehend not: and here I will reſt the argument for a while, and leave the matter to be determined by any ſenſible man of the Rebuffer's own party.

If indeed this learned adverſary had proved, that kings, as kings, not only bear the temporal but the *ſpiritual* ſword; and are not only chief magiſtrates, but have veſted alſo in their perſons the power of a provincial council of biſhops, (for no leſs church authority can either deprive or depoſe a biſhop), then what he had ſaid might have been ſomething to the purpoſe. But till that be proved, and I have no great fear that it can be proved, all his ſhew of reaſoning, are words without meaning, mere logomachy, and nothing more. Indeed, if the power of deprivation be neceſſarily included in the kingly office, why did God inveſt Solomon with an *extraordinary commiſſion* to order the courſes of the prieſts. In ſhort, if it be true, that becauſe Solomon, by an immediate authority, as a prophet, or by an extraordinary commiſſion, deprived Abiathar, therefore all other kings may lawfully deprive the biſhops in their ſeveral countries; may not, for the ſame reaſon, every ſupreme civil magiſtrate preach the goſpel and diſpenſe its ſacraments, becauſe Samuel, who was the ſupreme civil magiſtrate, (but no prieſt), as a prophet, offered ſacrifice? And if ſo, how hard was poor Saul's fate, who for this very thing, though in a caſe of extreme neceſſity, had his kingdom torn from him, 1 Sam. xiii. 14. And how unjuſtly does the church of England decree, that her chief magiſtrates have neither the power of preaching nor diſpenſing ſacraments? (Article 37.) Nay, may I not ſtill ſay, with the Remarker, that the reformers might with equal juſtice plead the command to the Iſraelites for burning the groves of the Canaanites, as an apology for their demoliſhing the Popiſh churches? For though the Rebuffer tells us that burning groves, and pulling down churches, are different and incongruous proceedings, and that

though

though Almighty God authoriſed the one, the divine authority cannot warrant the other, p. 45, 46; yet I imagine this reaſoning will not weigh much with many. For, if God was as much Lord proprietor of the Popiſh churches as of the Heathen groves, and if both of them had been abuſed to idolatrous purpoſes, is it not obvious, that he who authoriſed the one, might, if he had ſo pleaſed, without denying or contradicting himſelf, have alſo injoined the other? In ſhort, is it not obvious, that the difference between the two caſes does not conſiſt in their being diſſimilar-incongruous actions; but in this, that the Iſraelites acted by divine authority, and ſo were righteous in what they did; whereas the reformers acted without divine authority, and therefore were wicked and ſacrilegious, or at leaſt very ignorant and miſtaken men? And is not this preciſely the caſe of Solomon and the Scotch convention at the Revolution? The former acted by a particular commiſſion and immediate authority from Almighty God, the latter without either. Hitherto therefore the Remarker's argument, drawn from Solomon's extraordinary commiſſion, and his acting as a prophet, remains unſhaken, and I ſuppoſe will do ſo: and while that is the caſe, all that the Rebuffer has ſaid, or can ſay on this affair of Abiathar, is nothing to the purpoſe: Becauſe, though he could prove that Abiathar was the eldeſt branch of the Aaronick family, and that he was ſtrictly and literally degraded from the prieſthood by King Solomon as a prophet, it would not follow that the Scotch biſhops were lawfully deprived, unleſs King William had an extraordinary commiſſion from God, or acted alſo as a prophet.

But happily our learned adverſary has alſo yielded this point; I mean, that Abiathar was not the eldeſt branch of the Aaronick family. For attempting (p. 47. fig. 6.) to aſſign the reaſons why neither Abiathar, his father Ahimelech, or predeceſſor Eli, are recorded in the liſt of hereditary high-prieſts, 1 Chron. vi. he has theſe words: "Ezra recorded the names of "*lineal ſucceſſors*, therefore it was no part of his ſcheme to men-"tion Abiathar, or Ahimelech the father of Abiathar, or Ahiah "the elder brother of Ahimelech, becauſe they were *collaterals* "to Zadok." Well then Ezra's liſt of high-prieſts, (1 Chron. vi.) is a liſt of *lineal ſucceſſors*, and Zadok is in that liſt, and Abiathar is not in it, becauſe he was a collateral to Zadok. Now, let me aſk this reverend Rebuffer, in *what* and to *whom* was Zadok a *lineal ſucceſſor?* Was he not lineal ſucceſſor in the high prieſthood? and lineal ſucceſſor to his father Ahitub, his grandfather Amariah, and ſo upwards to Aaron, through Eleazar? as the ſacred text informs us, verſe 3.: And if ſo, let me farther aſk my learned adverſary, Whether, ſince Zadok was the lineal ſucceſſor to Aaron, through Eleazar, and Abiathar was a collateral to Zadok, if it be poſſible, that Zadok could be other than the eldeſt branch

of

of the Aaronick family? and, Whether it be poſſible, that Abiathar could be the repreſentative, as he alledges? To make this plain by an example: Suppoſe our learned Rebuſſer's grandfather had been boatman at Monimuſk, as I am told, his father, if alive, now is; ſuppoſe too, that his elder brother, if he has one, had laboured in the ſame honeſt occupation; and that my reverend antagoniſt himſelf, inſtead of rapping his head againſt a pulpit, had alſo plied the oar for a ſcanty livelihood: ſuppoſe farther, that a liſt of lineal ſucceſſors in that innocent though not very honourable employment, were ordered to be publiſhed by authority; I aſk, Whether the Rebuffer or his eldeſt brother, both boatmen by the ſuppoſition, would be recorded in this caſe, as lineal ſucceſſor to their father and grandfather? If his eldeſt brother, as I apprehend every man of ſenſe will acknowledge, then let me farther aſk, Whether, if Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, had been elder brother to Zadok, he, who died in the exerciſe of the high-prieſthood, 1 Sam. xxi. 16, 18. would have been omitted by a divine penman, and the ſucceſſion derived through his younger brother, who, for ought that appears, was not one whit a worthier or better man? Here again I will reſt the argument, and leave it to be decided by any man of common ſenſe, and common veracity.

The Rebuffer therefore may with an audacity peculiar to himſelf defy all the world as he pleaſes, (*vid.* Rebuff, p. 47.) but he will never be able to rid his feet of this conceſſion, which yet he could neither have the confidence nor the conſcience to refuſe, becauſe the light of truth flaſhed him ſo ſtrongly in the face. But no matter for that.—He tells us again, "That God expreſſ-"ly declared, by his prophet Samuel, 1 Sam. ii. 27. that Eli "was a lineal deſcendent of his forefather, to whom the grant "of an everlaſting prieſthood was made;" that is, of Phinehas the ſon of Eleazar. But though, by referring us to Numb. xxv. he would have us believe that the promiſe of perpetual prieſthood, mentioned 1 Sam. ii. 27. was the ſame made to Phinehas, Numb. xxv.; yet the learned divines who ordered the references to be marked on the margins of our Bibles, and underſtood the ſcripture fully as well as this moſt learned commentator, direct us to look to Exod. iv. for the explanation of the promiſe made to Eli's houſe: and ſo does the great Biſhop Patrick, a Revolution biſhop, and one of the beſt commentators on the Old Teſtament that I have ſeen. Which ſhews, that in the judgement of thoſe truly learned divines, the promiſe mentioned 1 Sam. ii. 27. is not that made to Phinehas, Numb. xxv. but that made to Aaron, Exod. iv. to whom, as well as to his grandſon, God gave the prieſthood by a *perpetual ſtatute*, which I preſume is of the ſame import with an everlaſting covenant. I may add, that not only the above great biſhop, but Dr Wells, and Mr Pyle, both alſo learned

learned commentators, and of the Rebuffer's own communion, are all clearly of opinion that Zadok was the repreſentative of Eleazar, and Eli the houſe of Ithamar. Nay, as far as I know, there never was one divine, before this learnedeſt of all learned men, my renowned adverſary, who held the contrary opinion. And I am not much afraid that his opinion, weighty as it is, will perſuade very many againſt the direct words of holy writ. Indeed, ſince God has expreſsly declared, 1 Chron. vi. that Zadok was lineal ſucceſſor to Eleazar, it is impoſſible that the promiſe alluded to, 1 Sam. xi. 27. as to Eli's houſe, could be that made to Phinehas, as the Rebuffer ſuppoſes, becauſe that would make Eli the repreſentative of Eleazar, and ſo God contradict himſelf.

I might follow this learned gentleman through all that confuſion of argument and variety of quotations from holy ſcripture, wherewith, in many ſubſequent pages, he has darkened counſel by words without knowledge, and might ſhew, that there is neither propriety in his application of the texts, nor ſtrength and ſolidity in the inferences deduced from them: but that would ſwell this pamphlet to an unneceſſary bulk; and therefore, till he fairly confutes what has been already advanced, I will purſue him no farther upon this topic; but will conclude it by aſking a few queſtions, almoſt in his own words. And,

1*ſt*, Seeing God threatened againſt Eli, that *every one in his houſe* ſhould come and crouch to the faithful high-prieſt, (that is Zadok, ſays Patrick and the beſt commentators), for a morſel of bread, is it poſſible to believe that Zadok, to whom they were to come and crouch, and who was in the moſt affluent circumſtances, could be a deſcendent of this very Eli? "Can the Rebuffer's trifling and falſe "gloſs, that a houſe comprehends only the eldeſt branch of a "family," as if the younger children no way belonged to it, can that trifling gloſs, I ſay, which leaves Zadok a branch of Eli's houſe in poſſeſſion "of almoſt kingly riches, come up to the full "extent of the original threatening againſt *every one of that* "*houſe?*" And might not the Rebuffer "as reaſonably attempt "to ſail over the Atlantic ocean in an egg-ſhell," as pretend to aſſert, that Zadok could live and die in the enjoyment of the higheſt and *wealthieſt* eccleſiaſtical office, and yet belong to a houſe, *every one* of which was to be reduced to the moſt diſtreſſful circumſtances? eſpecially "when he ſupports his opinion by "ſuch flimſy and contradictory gloſſes, in direct oppoſition to the "plain ſenſe of holy ſcripture."

Again: If it was in Zadok's power to put the miſerable deſcendents of Eli's houſe into the *prieſts offices* upon their application to him, does not that prove that Abiathar's ejection was not a diveſting him of his *character*, and a *forfeiture of his poſterity*, as the Rebuffer expreſsly affirms, but only a conſequential

ſequential deprivation, as the Remarker alledged? ſeeing, had Abiathar been degraded, and his poſterity forfeited, the law of Moſes appointed no method for reſtoring them again to any part of the prieſtly functions.

But, ſhould I give up to my learned antagoniſt all that I have ſaid concerning Solomon and Abiathar, ſo *gracious*, as well as ſo *generous* an enemy is he, that he has made conceſſion ſufficient to anſwer my purpoſe, in the very next words, p. 64. fig. 12. "I never ſaid, (adds my renowned adverſary), that "the *orders* of the anterevolution biſhops in Scotland were "invalid, in conſequence of their ejection by the civil magiſ-"trate." Now, although I know not, nor, I believe, can our reverend author himſelf tell, to what good purpoſe he has waſted ſo much paper and ink, if he meant not to ſay, they were invalid; and though I apprehend the words he owns he did ſay, "That they forfeited the character of Catholic biſhops," if they have any meaning, and are true, muſt imply, that thoſe biſhops orders were invalid: for how can a man retain the *orders*, who has ferfeited the *character* of a Catholic biſhop? For do we not ſay, in common language, ſuch a one is in the *character* of a Catholic biſhop, and ſuch another one is *not in the character* of a biſhop? And what do we mean when we ſay ſo, but, that the one is, the other is not a biſhop? But, not to take advantage of this *trifling* inaccuracy; the gentleman only means, it ſeems, that the Scots biſhops, by their deprivation, loſt their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction. And, not to be behind with him in courteſy, I ſhall, to pleaſe him, grant, for once, what I do not think true, and I am certain he has not proved, *viz.* That the civil magiſtrate may, without the interpoſition of church authority, deprive a biſhop of his dioceſe, and take away his *legal right* to ſpiritual juriſdiction: yet I hope he will not require me to grant what I fancy he himſelf does not believe, I mean, that the ſovereign can bind the conſciences of his ſubjects, and oblige them to ſubmit to what ſpiritual governors he pleaſes; for example, to Preſbyterian miniſters, inſtead of biſhops: for how then will he juſtify his own conduct? And if not: was it not lawful for the inferior clergy and people of Scotland to put themſelves, after the Revolution, under the guidance of their old biſhops; who, though deprived of juriſdiction according to law, yet, having valid orders, might certainly, with conſent of the ſubjects to be governed, acquire juriſdiction agreeable to the rules of the goſpel? Had they all retired to ſome deſert iſland at that time, the Rebuffer, I preſume, will readily agree, that, as they were ſound in the faith, they would in that iſland have formed a pure and true part of Chriſt's Catholic church: becauſe, as it is the duty of all Chriſtian people, to attend Chriſtian worſhip, receive the holy Euchariſt from the hands of lawfully-ordained

fully-ordained clergymen, and to ſubmit themſelves to lawful biſhops, as governors of Chriſt's appointment; ſo it is the duty of ſuch biſhops as have no particular dioceſe allotted to them, to govern, teach, and take the inſpection of ſuch people as, having no other particular heads, ſhall require them ſo to do. In a deſert iſland therefore, I ſay, our Scotch biſhops and prieſts, having valid orders, and being found in the faith, with Chriſtian people ſubmitting to their authority, would have formed, after the Revolution, a true and lawful part of Chriſt's Catholic church: and if ſo, ſurely it made no odds, that they did not leave their own country. For though a Britiſh King and parliament has a phyſical power to overturn Epiſcopacy, and eſtabliſh Preſbyterianiſm, or any other form of government they pleaſe; yet, if Epiſcopacy be an apoſtolical inſtitution, as the Rebuffer acknowledges, and conſequently of divine right, it will be doubted, I ſuppoſe, whether they could warrantably do it; I mean, agreeable to the rules of the goſpel: becauſe it will not be readily granted, that the moſt righteous government has authority to overturn a divine inſtitution. That, for a juſt cauſe, they may deprive biſhops of their temporal dignities and revenues, is moſt certainly true; and that K—— W—— and the Scotch convention believed they did well, in depriving the Scotch biſhops, I have no doubt, nor ſhall I controvert the point: but ſurely it will not be ſaid that they could lawfully compel their ſubjects to renounce Epiſcopacy; nor, of conſequence, can it be ſaid, that the prieſts, and people who believed the ejected biſhops to be ſtill lawful biſhops, had not a right in the eye of God to put themſelves under the inſpection of thoſe ejected biſhops, and ſo to form a church with ſpiritual, though not with legal juriſdiction. For though, when the church is eſtabliſhed by law, ſhe departs, and very properly, from her ſpiritual inherent right of independency, and gives the King an intereſt in the nomination of her biſhops, becauſe of the ſecular advantages they derive from the ſtate; yet, as it is indiſputably certain, that the biſhops in the primitive church, for more than three hundred years, were elected without the conſent of the ſovereign, ſo it is no leſs obvious, that when Epiſcopacy is overturned in any particular country, and no benefit accrues to the church from the civil government, ſhe may reſume the original powers veſted in her by Chriſt Jeſus, and conſtitute biſhops, and continue the apoſtolical ſucceſſion without the conſent of the ſovereign, as the primitive church did. Indeed, if this were not ſo, a Preſbyterian King and parliament might not only overturn Epiſcopacy, but might aboliſh it altogether; which, if a divine inſtitution, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe they can have right to do. I conclude therefore, that there may be lawful biſhops, and conſequently, a lawful church, without the conſent of a Chriſtian King, as well as

without the permiſſion of a Heathen king. For, let us ſuppoſe that the Scotch biſhops and clergy were to blame, in not abjuring King James VII. it was, I think, a miſtake that they might naturally fall into. King James was deſcended of a race of kings the moſt ancient in the univerſe: his family, if we truſt our hiſtorians, had governed Scotland for more than two thouſand years, and had been connected by intermarriages with almoſt the whole nobility and gentry in the kingdom; and if ſo, was it not natural to be prejudiced in favour of a race who could boaſt of ſuch high antiquity, and who was, if I may ſo ſpeak, our own fleſh and blood? Beſides, as all the miſtakes in government, ſince the Revolution, have been aſcribed, and I believe juſtly, rather to the miniſters than to the kings, the clergy and people of Scotland, who knew that James VII. was betrayed by the Earl of Sunderland, in whom he placed the greateſt confidence, might with reaſon impute the faults before the Revolution, to that unworthy favourite, and his fellow miniſters; and of conſequence, might judge very favourably of their unhappy ſovereign. I may add, that the laws of Scotland, previous to the Revolution, gave no great countenance to reſiſtance: for God, and not the people, was then believed to be the *only Ruler* of princes, as the church of England to this day teaches in her prayers; nor had the anterevolution biſhops ſuch clear eyes as the Rebuffer has, to ſee the doctrine of forfeiting kings delivered in holy ſcripture as lawful doctrine, nor the actual practice of it illuſtrated by examples there. It is true, St Paul's 13th chapter to the Romans, and St Peter and St Jude's epiſtles, may no doubt be conſtrued, by the ingenuity of an able commentator, like the Rebuffer, as countenancing the power of the ſubject: and David's heart ſmiting him for cutting off the hem only of perſecuting Saul's garment, *&c.* as well as our bleſſed Lord's reproof to Peter, for drawing his ſword againſt the civil magiſtrate, even in defence of his own divine perſon, may be brought, for ought I know, as examples of this favourite doctrine. It muſt be owned however, that, at firſt ſight at leaſt, they don't look that way; and when it is farther conſidered, that the holy church throughout the world in the beginning, who had the beſt opportunities of knowing the meaning of the holy ſcriptures, did not underſtand them as ſuch encouragers of reſiſtance, as is now pleaded for, but thought themſelves bound to perſiſt, as the Rebuffer himſelf acknowledges, in duty to the civil magiſtrate, even when they were perſecuted by thoſe magiſtrates for worſhipping the true God, and the only Mediator between God and man, in oppoſition to the falſe deities of deluded idolaters: when all this, I ſay, is conſidered, it need not ſeem ſtrange, that the anterevolution biſhops had ſome attachment to their ancient king. An error in them I have ſuppoſed it might

might have been; but ſurely it was an error in judgement, not in their heart; a ſin of ignorance, and not a wilful ſin; and ſo could not be a dangerous and damnable crime. They followed the dictates of their conſciences, and gave the ſtrongeſt proof of their ſincerity, by renouncing, for conſcience ſake, all the riches and honours of this world, and taking up with poverty and perſecution. From all which I conclude, that the Scotch clergy and people, after the Revolution, might be good men and good Chriſtians, and a pure part of the catholic church, notwithſtanding their miſtakes about the civil government. And as the Rebuffer acknowledges, that the biſhops had ſtill valid orders after their deprivation, though without legal juriſdiction, it is evident, from what has been ſaid, that the inferior clergy and people, by ſubmitting to thoſe biſhops, gave them a right of government over them; and ſo they became poſſeſſed again of ſpiritual juriſdiction. In ſhort, the church of Scotland, after the Revolution, was in the ſame ſtate as the primitive church for more than three hundred years; and continued in that condition till the death of Dr Roſe biſhop of Edinburgh, the laſt ſurvivor of the anterevolution biſhops, when indeed the church of Scotland became entirely vacant. For, though there were biſhops *in* Scotland at that period, there were none who had juriſdiction over any part of the church *of* Scotland; becauſe they were neither appointed to particular dioceſes by the former local biſhops, nor were they choſen, or ſubmitted to (which I think is much the ſame) by the clergy and people: and I know no other method but one of theſe two, ever practiſed in the church of God, whereby biſhops could acquire a right to ſpiritual juriſdiction. As for the power theſe Utopian biſhops claimed, of governing the church of Scotland like a ſingle dioceſe, in a collegiate manner, there was no precedent for that practice from the age of the apoſtles; and therefore could not then, nor ought not at any time to be ſubmitted to; becauſe it was making ſuch an alteration in the inſtituted government of the church, as all the biſhops in the world have not a power to make in theſe days, without a particular revelation. Though therefore the biſhops, at the death of Dr Roſe, had a power to govern, and to teach, as the Rebuffer tells us, and I ſhall add, to confirm alſo and to ordain; yet, not being appointed to particular dioceſes, by the local biſhops, as already ſaid, they could exerciſe no part of their powers, without the conſent of the ſubjects who were to be governed and taught: and though the clergy and people of Scotland were obliged, by the law of God and his church, to ſubmit themſelves to Epiſcopal governors; yet they were under no obligation to ſubmit to the perſons then veſted with Epiſcopal powers in Scotland, as thoſe very biſhops themſelves

themſelves confeſſed, at their firſt meeting with the Edinburgh preſbytery, after the death of Dr Roſe; but were at liberty to chuſe others, whoſe principles and tempers were more agreeable to them. Some of them however they did chuſe; and thoſe ſo choſen from that time commenced dioceſan biſhops, with ſpiritual, though not legal juriſdiction. Whereas the college biſhops, as a college, could not by any law, human or divine, claim a title to ſpiritual juriſdiction; and conſequently, every act and deed of theirs, as a college, was uſurpation without right, and ſo, in the eye of God, and all good men, null and void. And now, if after what has been ſaid, the Rebuffer does not ſee, how the poſt-revolution biſhops, who were *elected into particular diſtricts*, had a title to ſpiritual juriſdiction, and a right to govern thoſe diſtricts, according to the law of the *goſpel*, though not according to the law of the *land*; and conſequently, that there was a regular church in Scotland under them at that time. And if he does not ſee that the college biſhops, becauſe they were *not elected to particular diſtricts*, neither had, nor could have, a right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, or power of governing or cenſure, by any law human or divine, it is not becauſe the thing is not proved, (if either the ſoundeſt reaſoning, or the principles and practice of the Chriſtian church in the firſt and pureſt ages, can prove any thing), but becauſe he *will* not, or *cannot* ſee: and ſo, as the Remarker before obſerved, the fault muſt be placed to the account either of his head or his heart, and he may chuſe to lay it on what part he pleaſes.

The learned gentleman imagines, Reb. p. 29, 30. that he has catched his antagoniſts in an inextricable dilemma; and he ſeems diſpoſed, if he could, to be witty upon the occaſion: but had he conſidered the juſt and neceſſary diſtinction between the *ordinary* and *extraordinary* power of biſhops, he would not have found ſo much room for triumph as he fancies. When the author of the letter from Aberdeen ſaid, that orders *in* the church of England, ties the perſons ordained *to* the church of England, he meant, that it does ſo in all common caſes; becauſe every biſhop is ordinarily confined in the exerciſe of his authority to his own dioceſe; and it is obvious, that for the preſervation of order and peace, ſo it ought to be. But yet, this does not hinder biſhops, upon extraordinary occaſions, as when the governors of any church turn heretics, or ſchiſmatics, or cauſeleſsly and obſtinately refuſe to conſecrate a preſbyter canonically elected, againſt whoſe learning and morals, *&c.* there is no valid objection; I ſay, biſhops being ordinarily obliged to execute their paſtoral office within their own dioceſes only, does not hinder, but that when the great law of ediſication requires it, and on ſuch uncommon occaſions as thoſe above mentioned, they may lawfully

fully ordain and confirm out of their own dioceſe, and even out of their own national church: becauſe every biſhop has the charge in ſome meaſure of the Catholic church, as well as of a particular diſtrict. In this manner did St Athanaſius act during the prevalency of Arianiſm; and Epiphanius, and other biſhops, on different occaſions, as might be made appear, were it needful, from the undoubted monuments of Chriſtian antiquity. And thus the author of the letter from Aberdeen, and the Remarker, are perfectly reconciled, without the leaſt contradiction; and the Rebuffer's witticiſm about the Jeſuits diſcovers only his own ignorance. By the by, the Engliſh biſhops not interfering in Scotland after the Revolution, to take thoſe under their inſpection who had complied with the new government, is, I think, an unanſwerable argument, that they did not believe the ejected biſhops authority vacated, as the Rebuffer tells us. For as none underſtood church principles, nor the extenſive powers of the Epiſcopate in caſes of neceſſity better than Biſhops Beveridge, Bull, and other compliers in England; ſo, I am verily perſuaded, that none were better diſpoſed, nor would have been more ready to have exerted thoſe powers in behalf of any part of the church of Chriſt, which, through the fault of the ſuperior order, had been deprived of rightful governors, and left as ſheep without ſhepherds, than thoſe gentlemen. And therefore, had they been of opinion, that the Scotch biſhops, by what the Rebuffer calls their breach of duty to the civil magiſtrate, had forfeited their characters as Catholic biſhops, and their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, they would moſt certainly have interpoſed, and taken the people under their protection, and both ordained and collated clergymen to take the care of them, agreeable to the laws of the Catholic church in ſuch caſes. For though they had no more power over Scotland than over Tartary, nor could interfere, without the dreadful guilt of ſchiſm, while there were biſhops in Scotland poſſeſſed of ſpiritual juriſdiction; yet the moment thoſe biſhops were juſtly deprived of their authority, that moment the Engliſh biſhops knew they had a right to interfere as biſhops of the Catholic church: nay, as the neighbouring biſhops, they were in conſcience obliged to interfere; becauſe upon them the right of government naturally devolved. I may add, that they might do the ſame in Tartary, were there Chriſtians in that country without lawful biſhops: and therefore, that they did not interfere in Scotland, could only proceed from a full conviction that they could not lawfully do it; becauſe, though the Scotch biſhops had loſt their legal, yet they ſtill retained their *ſpiritual* juriſdiction.

And thus theſe few lines might ſerve as a full anſwer to all the Rebuffer has ſaid in both his performances, except in ſo far

as

themſelves confeſſed, at their firſt meeting with the Edinburgh preſbytery, after the death of Dr Roſe; but were at liberty to chuſe others, whoſe principles and tempers were more agreeable to them. Some of them however they did chuſe; and thoſe ſo choſen from that time commenced dioceſan biſhops, with ſpiritual, though not legal juriſdiction. Whereas the college biſhops, as a college, could not by any law, human or divine, claim a title to ſpiritual juriſdiction; and conſequently, every act and deed of theirs, as a college, was uſurpation without right, and ſo, in the eye of God, and all good men, null and void. And now, if after what has been ſaid, the Rebuffer does not ſee, how the poſt-revolution biſhops, who were *elected into particular diſtricts*, had a title to ſpiritual juriſdiction, and a right to govern thoſe diſtricts, according to the law of the *goſpel*, though not according to the law of the *land*; and conſequently, that there was a regular church in Scotland under them at that time. And if he does not ſee that the college biſhops, becauſe they were *not elected to particular diſtricts*, neither had, nor could have, a right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, or power of governing or cenſure, by any law human or divine, it is not becauſe the thing is not proved, (if either the ſoundeſt reaſoning, or the principles and practice of the Chriſtian church in the firſt and pureſt ages, can prove any thing), but becauſe he *will* not, or *cannot* ſee: and ſo, as the Remarker before obſerved, the fault muſt be placed to the account either of his head or his heart, and he may chuſe to lay it on what part he pleaſes.

The learned gentleman imagines, Reb. p. 29, 30. that he has catched his antagoniſts in an inextricable dilemma; and he ſeems diſpoſed, if he could, to be witty upon the occaſion: but had he conſidered the juſt and neceſſary diſtinction between the *ordinary* and *extraordinary* power of biſhops, he would not have found ſo much room for triumph as he fancies. When the author of the letter from Aberdeen ſaid, that orders *in* the church of England, ties the perſons ordained *to* the church of England, he meant, that it does ſo in all common caſes; becauſe every biſhop is ordinarily confined in the exerciſe of his authority to his own dioceſe; and it is obvious, that for the preſervation of order and peace, ſo it ought to be. But yet, this does not hinder biſhops, upon extraordinary occaſions, as when the governors of any church turn heretics, or ſchiſmatics, or cauſeleſsly and obſtinately refuſe to conſecrate a preſbyter canonically elected, againſt whoſe learning and morals, *&c.* there is no valid objection; I ſay, biſhops being ordinarily obliged to execute their paſtoral office within their own dioceſes only, does not hinder, but that when the great law of edification requires it, and on ſuch uncommon occaſions as thoſe above mentioned, they may lawfully

fully ordain and confirm out of their own dioceſe, and even out of their own national church: becauſe every biſhop has the charge in ſome meaſure of the Catholic church, as well as of a particular diſtrict. In this manner did St Athanaſius act during the prevalency of Arianiſm; and Epiphanius, and other biſhops, on different occaſions, as might be made appear, were it needful, from the undoubted monuments of Chriſtian antiquity. And thus the author of the letter from Aberdeen, and the Remarker, are perfectly reconciled, without the leaſt contradiction; and the Rebuffer's witticiſm about the Jeſuits diſcovers only his own ignorance. By the by, the Engliſh biſhops not interfering in Scotland after the Revolution, to take thoſe under their inſpection who had complied with the new government, is, I think, an unanſwerable argument, that they did not believe the ejected biſhops authority vacated, as the Rebuffer tells us. For as none underſtood church principles, nor the extenſive powers of the Epiſcopate in caſes of neceſſity better than Biſhops Beveridge, Bull, and other compliers in England; ſo, I am verily perſuaded, that none were better diſpoſed, nor would have been more ready to have exerted thoſe powers in behalf of any part of the church of Chriſt, which, through the fault of the ſuperior order, had been deprived of rightful governors, and left as ſheep without ſhepherds, than thoſe gentlemen. And therefore, had they been of opinion, that the Scotch biſhops, by what the Rebuffer calls their breach of duty to the civil magiſtrate, had forfeited their characters as Catholic biſhops, and their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, they would moſt certainly have interpoſed, and taken the people under their protection, and both ordained and collated clergymen to take the care of them, agreeable to the laws of the Catholic church in ſuch caſes. For though they had no more power over Scotland than over Tartary, nor could interfere, without the dreadful guilt of ſchiſm, while there were biſhops in Scotland poſſeſſed of ſpiritual juriſdiction; yet the moment thoſe biſhops were juſtly deprived of their authority, that moment the Engliſh biſhops knew they had a right to interfere as biſhops of the Catholic church: nay, as the neighbouring biſhops, they were in conſcience obliged to interfere; becauſe upon them the right of government naturally devolved. I may add, that they might do the ſame in Tartary, were there Chriſtians in that country without lawful biſhops: and therefore, that they did not interfere in Scotland, could only proceed from a full conviction that they could not lawfully do it; becauſe, though the Scotch biſhops had loſt their legal, yet they ſtill retained their *ſpiritual* juriſdiction.

And thus theſe few lines might ſerve as a full anſwer to all the Rebuffer has ſaid in both his performances, except in ſo far

as

as reſpects the Simony. However, I ſhall follow him throughout; and therefore now proceed to conſider what the Rebuſſer has advanced from p. 68. ſig. 16. to p. 78. fig. 17. In his firſt performance he had told us, that the difference between the primitive biſhops and our anterevolution biſhops conſiſted in this, that the former practiſed a *requiſite perſeverance in duty* to the civil magiſtrate, p. 161. whereby they retained their title to the character of Catholic biſhops, and a right to ſpiritual juriſdiction: whereas the Scotch biſhops "failed in their duty to the civil "magiſtrate, and thereby forfeited, *ipſo facto*, their title to "the character of Catholic biſhops, and with their characters, "all right to ſpiritual juriſdiction." Whereupon the author of the letter from Edinburgh went to work upon the gentleman's own conceſſions, and argued with him to this purpoſe: That, ſince it was the perſeverance of the primitive biſhops in duty to the Heathen emperors, even when they perſecuted them for worſhipping the true God, which preſerved thoſe biſhops title to be Catholic biſhops, and their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, the ſame requiſite perſeverance in duty to King James VII. was neceſſary to preſerve the Scotch biſhops title to the character of Catholic biſhops, and their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction; unleſs it can be ſhewn, that King James's attempt to pervert his ſubjects to the Romiſh religion, was a juſter cauſe for reſiſtance, than the Roman emperor's perſecution for worſhipping the true God. And now, what does our learned adverſary reply to this argument? Why, after delivering this ſingular opinion, (which I apprehend does no great honour to his judgement, more than to his principles), that Popery is worſe than Heatheniſm, he tells us, p. 75. *1ſt*, That allegiance was due to King James VII. not perſonally as to a man, but legally as to a king. *2dly*, That the Britiſh biſhops, being part of the legiſlative body, were bound to ſupport the law againſt the king; and conſequently, to reſiſt the king when he tranſgreſſed the law: whereas the primitive biſhops, having no ſhare in the legiſlature, could not pretend to that privilege. And, *3dly*, That though James VII. was once King of Britain before the Revolution, yet not always; having forfeited his title before he left England. And then he directs us to the word of God, where he ſays this doctrine of forfeiting kings, is eſtabliſhed as a true principle, and illuſtrated by ſeveral inſtances.

As to the firſt of theſe maxims, not to inſiſt upon the authority of Lord Chief Juſtice Coke, one of the greateſt lawyers that ever England bred, who, in his Reports, (part 7.) tells us that allegiance is due, by the law of nature, to the *perſon* of the ſovereign, and not to his crown; and that this law of nature is part of the law of the land: not to inſiſt that this bleſſed maxim

is

is a revival of that happy diſtinction ſo famous in the days of the covenant between the *perſonal* and *political* capacity of the king, when the ſaints of the Lord glorioufly fought (as our learned adverſary, upon his principles, alſo muſt have fought) under the immortal Old Noll, *for King Charles*, againſt the *tyrant Charles Stuart*: not to inſiſt that this diſtinction is expreſsly declared by act of parliament, to be a *traiterous poſition*; and that every clergyman of the church of England, when he ſigns the act of uniformity, ſwears, that he *abhors* that traiterous poſition of taking arms by the king's authority againſt his perſon: as alſo, ſwears, that *it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatſoever, to take arms againſt the King*: (with which laſt clauſe let the Rebuffer reconcile his principles, if he can.) But not to inſiſt on theſe things, I ſay, let me aſk this learned gentleman, Whether allegiance was due by the firſt Chriſtians to their Heathen Emperors perſonally, as to men, or legally, as to kings? If only legally, as to kings, "ruling according to laws divine and human," then the primitive biſhops might have reſiſted them when they ceaſed to be kings; that is, according to the Rebuffer, when "they "ceaſed to govern by law," and might have retained notwithſtanding, their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction: contrary to what my paſſive antagoniſt has aſſerted. But if allegiance was due to the Roman Emperors perſonally, as to men, I deſire to know what made the difference between them and our Britiſh ſovereigns? Why, ſays the Rebuffer, p. 71. the Roman Emperors "were abſolute, and ſo had no law but what their own will "dictated; whereas ours are limited monarchs, and therefore "bound to govern by ſtated laws." But let me again aſk, How it came to paſs, that the Roman Emperors had no laws but their own wills? Had the ſenate no power, the people no privileges, nor the empire any laws before Julius Cæſar? or had they none under him and his ſucceſſor Auguſtus? I fancy this will not be aſſerted: For before Julius Cæſar, the ſenate was ſupreme, and the Romans the freeſt people in the world; and all hiſtorians agree, that Auguſtus honoured the ſenate, continued their power, allowed the people their privileges, and did not govern ſolely by his will, but in general by known and ſtated laws. And if ſo, did thoſe monſters, his ſucceſſors, who trampled upon all law, who diſregarded the ſenate, and violated, upon every occaſion, the privileges of the people, become, by ſo doing, the more *lawful princes?* or did allegiance, on that account, become due to their *perſons*, and not to their *crowns?* Surely, if that was the caſe, it was ſtrange indeed: but it is ſuch an argument, as one would hardly expect from the mouth of a Revolutioniſt. And yet no better reaſon has my learned adverſary aſſigned, why the Roman Emperors could not be reſiſted, than their ruling by their

own will: which, however, is ſo far from being an argument *againſt* reſiſtance, that it is the ſtrongeſt reaſon, if reſiſtance be at all lawful, why they ſhould have been reſiſted. I conclude therefore, by undeniable conſequence, from the Rebuffer's principles, in ſpite of his firſt maxim, that ſeeing the primitive biſhops retained their characters as Catholic biſhops, and their title to ſpiritual juriſdiction, for this reaſon, that they perſevered in duty to the perſecuting Heathen Emperors, the Scotch biſhops, at the Revolution, could not forfeit their character as Catholic biſhops, nor their right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, by adhering to King James VII. who was a Chriſtian king, and not a perſecutor, or not in the ſame degree. No, ſays my learned adverſary: for though the Scotch biſhops were bound, as men and biſhops, to perſevere in duty like the primitive biſhops, yet not as legiſlators; which is his

2*d* Defence. But if the Scotch biſhops, notwithſtanding their ſhare in legiſlation, were debarred from reſiſtance by thoſe very laws which they had voluntarily conſented to; then it is obvious, that they could no more lawfully or conſtitutionally reſiſt, than private men. And that this was actually the caſe, the laws before the Revolution, and which this moment are in force, ſufficiently evince: for it was then, and ſtill is expreſs law, that not only the biſhops who are but *one* of three eſtates, are debarred from reſiſtance; but that neither lords nor commons, nay, nor the *whole people, in parliament, or out of parliament, neither collectively nor repreſentatively, ever had, have, or ought to have, any coercive power over the kings of theſe realms.* From which I again conclude, that if the primitive biſhops owed allegiance to their Heathen Emperors, even when they perſecuted them for worſhipping the true God, as the Rebuffer affirms; reſiſtance could not be lawful to the Scottiſh biſhops, although in part legiſlators, becauſe they were debarred from reſiſtance by the laws of their own making.

The *third* and laſt thing which the Rebuffer urges on this topic is, that although King James VII. was *once* lawful king before the Revolution, yet not always, having forfeited his title to the crown before he left England. And this principle, he ſays, that kings may forfeit their crowns, is eſtabliſhed in the word of God, and illuſtrated by ſeveral inſtances. Now this, I acknowledge, is ſomething to the purpoſe; and if the Rebuffer can make it good, (and who knows what ſo great a genius may do!) he will undoubtedly gain this part of his cauſe at leaſt. Let then this learned gentleman demonſtrate, by plain and clear texts of ſcripture, that hereditary kings, who are declared by law to hold their dominion from God only, may forfeit their crowns, and be puniſhed by their own ſubjects; and let him alſo point out thoſe inſtances

which

which illuſtrate and eſtabliſh this forfeiting doctrine; and then paſſive obedience will be as falſe as it is unfaſhionable. Indeed, had the Rebuffer uniformly maintained the modiſh doctrine of rebellion, and treated the firſt Chriſtian biſhops as a parcel of tame, ſpiritleſs, fooliſh nonjurors, who were equally ignorant of their civil privileges and natural rights, he might, for me, have enjoyed his own opinion in peace: nay, had he boldly preached up the lawfulneſs of depoſing, and even murdering kings, and the indiſpenſable neceſſity of ſubmitting to our ſovereign lords the mob, I ſhould not have attempted to diſpute the point with him. For, be the doctrine of reſiſtance true or falſe, it was no part of my plan to oppoſe or contradict it. But to play faſt and looſe on ſo intereſting a ſubject, betrays as much folly as want of principle: and particularly to aſſert, as he does, that perſeverance in duty to the *Heathen Emperors*, who trampled upon all laws, human and divine, was neceſſary to ſecure the primitive biſhops title to ſpiritual juriſdiction; and yet, to maintain, that the Scottiſh biſhops forfeited their title to be Catholic biſhops, and all right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, becauſe they perſevered in duty to their *Chriſtian king*, is as palpable an abſurdity as ever entered into the head or heart of man. But, ſays the Rebuffer, I never called the allegiance paid to the Heathen Emperors a *requiſite perſeverance in duty*. In anſwer to which I ſay, that he did call it, in expreſs terms, *a requiſite perſeverance*; ſee p. 161. of *Principles Political and Religious*; and he muſt be hard puſhed indeed, when, in order to defend himſelf, he denies his own words. Indeed, if that perſeverance in duty, which was neceſſary to ſecure the primitive biſhops right to ſpiritual juriſdiction, or, in other words, which gave them a right to govern the church of God, and without which they could have no right to govern it, was not requiſite with a witneſs, I do not know what that word means.

But ſhould we grant that the people, and not God, are the only rulers of princes, which the Rebuffer has not yet proved, and I think the church of England has given againſt him, [Pray: for the King morning and evening ſervice] yet it will coſt ſome trouble to determine when the people ought, or ought not to exerciſe their dominion. Biſhop Burnet, full as good a caſuiſt, if not ſo great a politician, as the Rebuffer, declares in expreſs terms, not only for himſelf, (Biſhop of Sarum's Vindication, p. 43.) but that he did not know *one divine, even of thoſe who forſook King James, and joined in the Revolution, that judged reſiſtance on account of religion to be lawful.* And if I could once believe this, I think it would not be eaſy to convince me, that reſiſtance on any other account is lawful. For if

it be not lawful to reſiſt in defence of that which is our *nobleſt privilege*, and *moſt valuable poſſeſſion*, that upon which *heaven* and *everlaſting happineſs depends*; I humbly apprehend, that civil rights and liberties, though very valuable, yet being inferior to the other, muſt be given up.

But no matter: ſays my learned antagoniſt, there was a time when King James VII. even before his departure out of the kingdom, ceaſed to be a true and rightful king of England, Reb. p. 74. That *his right* of dominion ceaſed, when the throne was declared vacant, no body now-a-days will dare to diſpute; but that it ceaſed *before* he left the kingdom, is not yet ſo generally underſtood. Prove therefore, good Mr Rebuffer, that fact as clearly as you have aſſerted it, and you will do more ſervice to your country, than all the political writers before or ſince the Revolution. Mean time, till that point be ſettled, let me aſk, Whether one tranſgreſſion forfeits the prince's title to his kingdom, or if it requires more? If one, hard is his fate indeed, and better be ſome people's hog than their ſovereign. If we muſt reverſe the poet's maxim, and ſay, *Quicquid delirant miniſtri, plectuntur reges*, and kings muſt ſuffer for the faults of falſe and faithleſs, ignorant or careleſs ſervants, by whoſe eyes they muſt ſee, and by whoſe hands they muſt act, merely becauſe what is done bears the ſovereign's name, they are of all men moſt miſerable. Or if forfeiture for one offence would be rather too ſevere, let me aſk again St Peter's queſtion, with ſome variation, How often ſhall our ſovereign ſin againſt the people, and they forgive him? And let the Rebuffer anſwer, either in the apoſtle's, or our bleſſed Saviour's words, Till ſeven times, or ſeventy times ſeven, as his judicious pericranium or Brechin infallibility ſhall judge moſt proper. But let him conſider, before he begins, that when he has once determined this point, he fixes a *ne plus ultra* to his preſent ſovereign, and to all future kings of Britain: that he in effect ſays to them, as Almighty God to the great deep, Hitherto ſhalt thou come and no further, and places a barrier betwixt lawful power and lawleſs deſpotiſm, which whoſoever of them approaches, ſhall ſtand aghaſt, and with fear and trembling, think on the *dreadful name of Sievewright!* And now, after what has been ſaid on this ſubject, let the ſkilful ſurgeon judge, whether the wound which the Rebuffer received with his own weapon from the Remarker, was not in good earneſt a mortal wound? ſeeing, notwithſtanding all the applications he has yet uſed, it ſtill feſters, and, without a very different method of cure, will for ever feſter.

But it is now time to come to the uſages. And upon this part of the Rebuff I ſhall be very ſhort. What the learned author ſays, if true, is indeed very ſtrong, and ought to prevail with

with every church as well as the church of England, to give them up; and that is, that they are contradictory to the word of God. He adds, that the church of England has left them out of her liturgy, and ſo there is an end of the matter. But with the Rebuffer's good leave, the matter is not ſo near an end as he imagines. For though the church of England has indeed left them out of her liturgy, which ſhews that ſhe does not think them eſſential; yet the Remarker clearly proved, by the act of parliament, which ratified King Edward VI.'s ſecond liturgy, that inſtead of believing them to be contradictory, ſhe even thought them *agreeable to the word of God, and the primitive church*, at the very time ſhe threw them out; and declared alſo, that ſuch people as deſerted the churches in which the uſages were practiſed, *lived without knowledge, and the due fear of God, and were guilty of a wilful and damnable ſin*. And how will it ſtrike the Rebuffer like a thunderbolt, when I ſhall tell him, and ſhall prove it too, that this part of that very act of parliament is ſtill in force? and conſequently, ſhall ſhew, that the uſages are ſtill even according to the teſtimony of the preſent church of England, agreeable to the *word of God and the primitive church*, and that whoſoever forſakes any church on account of them, lives without *knowledge and the due fear of God, and are guilty of a wilful and damnable ſin*. That this is ſo, the preamble to the act of uniformity injoined by Queen Elizabeth clearly proves: for that act annulled the act of repeal ſet forth by the Popiſh Queen Mary and her parliament, in ſo far as concerns the book of Common Prayer; and conſequently, reſtored the preamble above mentioned to King Edward VI.'s act. Upon this ſcore, I mean, as ſuppoſing the above preamble to be ſtill in force, the learned Mr Bowyer affirms, that the doctrine of the church of England with reſpect to the *ſacrifice* of the Chriſtian Euchariſt, is ſtill the ſame, as when the uſages were practiſed by her reformers. See his true account, in anſwer to Hoadley's plain account of the Lord's Supper, p. 54, 55. where he alſo expreſsly ſays, "That though the above act of King Edward was repealed "by Queen Mary, yet it was revived by Queen Elizabeth, and "confirmed by King Charles II." But though we could not vouch for the uſages by ſuch high authority; ſeeing the church of England, at the ſame time that ſhe hath given evidence, that ſhe thinks them not eſſential, yet has never, by any public deed, declared that ſhe believes them to be errors, far leſs hereſies; and ſeeing many of her greateſt ſcholars, and worthieſt members, as Arhbiſhop Laud, Biſhop Poynet, Mr Mede, Dr Brevint, Mr Scandaret, Mr Thorndike, before the Revolution, and ſince that period, Archbiſhop Wake, the great Biſhop Bull, Mr Bowyer, Mr Wheatley, the author of the new Whole Duty of Man,

Man, *&c. &c.* and above all, Mr Johnſon Vicar of Cranbrook, in his Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar unveiled and ſupported, who, as Mr Bowyer juſtly ſays, has exhauſted the ſubject, have appeared, all of them in the defence of ſome, and others in defence of every one of the uſages: I ſay, ſeeing the church of England has given no deciſion againſt the uſages, and that ſome of her beſt and ableſt clergymen have openly vindicated them, as conſonant to *her* doctrine, as well as agreeable to the word of God and the primitive church; is it not aſtoniſhing that there ſhould be one man found within her pale, one man indeed in the whole world, that ſhould dare to ſay, that they are not only contradictory to the word of God, but ſome of them, and particularly the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the ſacramental elements, downright blaſphemy! God complains of the Iſraelites, by the prophet Jeremiah, that *they were not aſhamed, neither could they bluſh;* and I am ſorry to obſerve, that the ſame complaint may be made of ſome in our days. For muſt not that man have a face of braſs, who dares to call *that* blaſphemy, (Rebuff, p. 81.) which not only the Engliſh church and Engliſh nation, in the act of parliament ſo often mentioned, has *declared to be agreeable to the word of God;* but which has been proved by clergymen of his own communion, Meſſrs Johnſon, Bingham, Bowyer, and others, to have been practiſed by the whole church of Chriſt from the beginning down to the Reformation. There is not one ancient liturgy extant, in which there is not an expreſs invocation; and Archbiſhop Wake, another learned and worthy primate of his own communion, will tell him, (preliminary diſcourſe to his Tranſlation of the apoſtolical Fathers, p. 102.) "*that thoſe prayers, "in which all the liturgies agree, in ſenſe at leaſt, if not in "words, it may reaſonably be preſumed, were firſt preſcribed in "the ſame or like terms by the apoſtles and evangeliſts.*" Poor Rebuffer! thou art fitter for a hoſpital than a pulpit; and even there I am afraid, there will be no cure found for a w---g h--d. But however that may be, in anſwer to what this enemy of truth has ſcribbled againſt the lawfulneſs of the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the ſacramental elements, the reader may be pleaſed to conſult Mr Bingham's Eccleſiaſtical Antiquities, vol. 6. Johnſon's Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar Unveiled, vol. 1. and Bowyer's true Account of the Lord's Supper, in anſwer to Hoadley's plain account; not to mention the writings of the Engliſh Nonjurors in defence of the uſages: where not only all that this poor creature has ſaid, but all that has been collected by the ableſt adverſaries of pure and primitive Chriſtianity, is fairly canvaſſed and fully refuted. And in defence of what is urged againſt placing the invocation *after*, and not *before* the words of inſtitution, ſee Dr Brett's Diſſertation on the ancient liturgies,

p. 135,

p. 135, 136.—While I only obſerve, that the Rebuffer is the unluckieſt champion that ever attempted to ſupport a good cauſe, ſeeing every weapon he uſes againſt his adverſary, almoſt infallibly recoils upon, and wounds himſelf. It is particularly ſo in this caſe: for if it be ſo criminal in the uſagers (who by the by follow in this practice, the whole Chriſtian church, except the Romiſh) to place the invocation after and not before the words of inſtitution, how guilty is the church of England herſelf, as Dr Brett well remarks, which, inſtead of uſing the words of inſtitution at the diſtribution, as our bleſſed Lord did; (for he bid his apoſtles take and eat, before he ſaid, This is my body), has taken them into her prayer of conſecration, and ordered very different expreſſions to be uſed at the diſtribution? I have only farther to add, that the arguments he has uſed againſt the invocation, ſuch as they are, perfectly coincide, and therefore are probably borrowed either from the worſt book of the moſt unprincipled biſhop that ever diſgraced the church of England, I mean, Dr Hoadley's Plain Account; or are ſuch as are urged by the Papiſts, in defence of the groſſeſt of all their errors, tranſubſtantiation. For Biſhop Hoadley argues, as the Rebuffer does, that our bleſſed Lord did not bleſs the bread and wine, (in direct contradiction to St Paul, who calls it the cup of bleſſing, which we bleſs), becauſe the word *it* is not in the original. And as our learned adverſary, ſo the Papiſts, to magnify the power of their prieſts, alſo ſay, (even in the face of their own maſs-book, which has ſtill a prayer of invocation), that the words of inſtitution alone are ſufficient for the conſecration. Thus Simeon and Levi, brethren in iniquity, join together; and in this good company I leave the Rev. Rebuffer, and proceed

To the *third* article of charge, the Simony. This is the moſt terrible of all terribles! But courage, my heart! Thou haſt pretty well eſcaped the former perils, perhaps thou mayſt have the good fortune to get unhurt through this alſo.

What the Rebuffer's view, in propaling ſo infamous a ſtory, which at this diſtance of time has all the guilt of the firſt invention, is, I ſhall not pretend to ſay. But if what I have heard alledged be true, that he means by it to blacken the whole party, in hopes that he may fill his bags, by prevailing on ſome of Mr D——'s congregation to forſake their old paſtor, and join his more hallowed miniſtrations, that is at once ſo wicked and ſo infamous a deſign, that nothing can juſtify it in the ſight of God, nor any thing but the extremity of want, even rags and beggary ſo much as palliate it in the eye of man. For my own part, I care not a penny, whether the accuſation be true or falſe; becauſe I am certain, I can juſtify the orders of the Nonj——t clergy in Scotland, in ſpite of what this defamer either has ſaid or

can

can ſay. Indeed, if I could not, woe would be to the whole Chriſtian world. For ſeeing, if there be any truth in hiſtory, Simony has been a very common crime both in the eaſtern and weſtern churches, in different ages, nobody could ſay, if the Rebuffer's principle holds true, that there is one lawful clergyman, or one rightly baptiſed Chriſtian now alive; becauſe no one can ſay, but that the biſhop or prieſt who ordained or baptiſed him, (or at leaſt that ſome one in the line of ſucceſſion from the apoſtles), has been guilty of Simony; and ſo all Chriſtians muſt live in the moſt dreadful uncertainty with reſpect to their very baptiſms. This the author of the Remarks obſerved before, and the Rebuffer has not denied it, and yet has made no anſwer; a ſure ſign that he can make none. For which reaſon it ſeems impoſſible, that he ſhould believe his own doctrine, otherwiſe he could never mount the pulpit, without the terrible apprehenſion of drawing near to God without being ſent, and conſequently of periſhing in the gainſaying of Corah. Indeed, as Simony can be committed ſo ſecretly that no eye but God's may ſee it, if it invalidates holy orders, thouſands of innocent clergymen, and millions of innocent people, might ſuffer in their moſt important, their ſpiritual intereſts, for the crime of one or two perſons, no otherwiſe related to them, than as deſcended from the ſame firſt parents: And as it is not conſiſtent with the goodneſs of God to permit it thus to be, I from thence conclude, that however atrocious a crime Simony may be in the perſons who are guilty of it, yet it no wiſe affects the orders of their innocent ſucceſſors.

I have ſaid this much upon general principles, for the ſatisfaction of well-meaning people, unacquainted with theſe matters, who might otherwiſe be ſtumbled at what this butcher of characters has boldly, but moſt falſely advanced. But with himſelf I can make ſhort work; becauſe I can not only ſhew, in general, from many different canons of the church of England, how common a practice the abominable crime of Simony heretofore has been in all its different ſhapes, as well among the biſhops as the inferior clergy of that church; but can alſo prove, in particular, by incontestible evidence, that ſeveral archbiſhops of Canterbury have been promoted through the *influence of money*, which neceſſarily, according to the Rebuffer's doctrine, deſtroys the orders of that whole church; becauſe the archbiſhops of Canterbury are not only immediately concerned in the conſecration of every biſhop within their own province, but alſo in the conſecration of the archbiſhop of York, which makes their influence extend over the whole kingdom.

The canons hereafter quoted, are theſe publiſhed by unexceptionable authority, the Rev. Mr John Johnſon Vicar of Cranbrook,

a clergyman of the Rebuffer's own communion. The reader then may conſult the excerptions of Ecgbright, *anno* 740, canon 43. which runs in theſe words: "If any biſhop, prieſt, or dea-" con, obtained this dignity with *money*, let both him and the " ordainer be depoſed," *&c.* Alſo the heads of theſe canons which were enacted at Wincheſter, *anno* 1070, under Archbiſhop Lanfrane; the firſt of which is "concerning the coming in " of *biſhops* and abbots by *Simoniacal hereſy*." And the ſecond, " concerning *ordaining* men promiſcuouſly, and by *means of mo-*" *ney*." So in a council held next year, at the ſame place, and under the ſame archbiſhop, the ſecond canon decrees, "That " no one be *ordained* by means of *Simoniacal hereſy*." In the council held at Weſtminſter under Archbiſhop Anſelm, *anno* 1102, we are told, that "three great abbots were depoſed for " *Simony*, and three others deprived for other crimes; but ſome " of them were afterwards reſtored by *dint of money*." In like manner, the firſt canon under Archbiſhop Corboyl, at London, 1126, forbids any man to be "*ordained for money*." So alſo, next year, at Weſtminſter, under the ſame archbiſhop, the firſt " forbids churches, dignities, and benefices, to be in any wiſe " *ſold or bought*;" and the ſecond forbids any man to be *or-*" *dained* or *preferred* by means of *money*." Again, of Archbiſhop Richard's canons, *anno* 1175, the ſeventh runs thus: "The " holy ſynod deteſts *Simoniacal hereſy*, and ordains that nothing " be demanded for *orders*, chriſm, baptiſm," *&c.* See alſo the canons under Stephen Langton, at Oxford, 1222, *viz.* the third and eighteenth; and under Othobon, 1268, can. 33. and many others. From all which, the reader muſt be convinced how ſtrongly infected the church of England in thoſe days muſt have been with Simony; ſeeing nothing elſe can account for ſo many different laws being made againſt that practice, within 200 years.

But, not to reſt upon a general charge, (though that alone, ſupported by ſo many canons, would in this caſe be ſufficient), I find in Mr Collier's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain, (the fulleſt and beſt vouched account that ever was given of the church of England), no leſs than three inſtances of the Archbiſhops of Canterbury being promoted, and ſome of them expreſsly ordained by the Pope himſelf, in conſequence of a bribe to the holy ſee, *viz.* Richard, Chancellor of Lincoln, promoted *anno* 1229, by Pope Gregory IX. againſt Walter de Hemiſton, choſen by the monks of Canterbury, who then had the right of election. The onerous cauſe of which preference was, a "pro-" miſe by the King's ambaſſador, of the tenth of all the ſtock " and money in England and Ireland, to ſupport him in his war " againſt the Emperor." Until that promiſe was made, the hiſtorian obſerves, that the Pope and conclave "were not very

" promiſing in their humour;" but upon getting the King's letters for the tenths, that made the matter ſecure, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Britain, p. 432, 433. So in the year 1313, Walter Reynolds Biſhop of Worceſter was tranſlated by papal authority to the ſee of Canterbury, in direct oppoſition to Cobham Dean of Saliſbury, regularly elected. The biſbop, to make good his point, " fenced againſt inconveniencies *with his money*," ibid. p. 508. And again, " Simom Mepham, being elected *anno* 1328 " by the convent, and approved of by the King, the election, " by the *intereſt of a good preſent, was confirmed by the Pope*, " who conſecrated Mepham at Avignon," p. 530. The vouchers quoted on the margin by Mr Collier, are for the firſt inſtance, Matth. Paris Hiſtory; for the ſecond, Godwin's *Angl. Sac. in Archiep. Cant.* and for the laſt, Cotton's Abridgement of the Tower Records, fol. 609. The authority of which, as far as I know, was never called in queſtion. If the Rebuffer ſhould plead that Reynold's being a biſhop before his promotion to the ſee of Canterbury, his orders could not be affected by his Simony at that time; I anſwer, that however good an argument that might be in another man's mouth, it comes but with an ill grace from him who has ſuch a knack at forfeiting, *ipſo facto*, the character of Catholic biſhops for much leſs crimes: or, though we ſhould ſuſtain that argument even from him, it neither defends the firſt or laſt caſe, becauſe both Richard and Mepham were raiſed to the Epiſcopal dignity directly in conſequence of Simony, and the laſt was ordained by the impious Pope himſelf, who actually received the money. And now things being thus, how imprudent, and I think I may add, how groſsly ignorant even of his own affairs, is this famous eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian! nay, how cruelly unnatural both to himſelf and to that church which he pretends to be his holy mother? ſeeing, with the deadly weapon of Simony, whereby he thought to hew only the ungodly, *i. e.* the wicked Nonjurors, to pieces, he has, by an unhappy back-blow, murdered himſelf as a prieſt, and ript up the bowels of his pious parent and all her children! And what a thirſt, what a rage for ſpiritual murder, (if I may be allowed the expreſſion) muſt this man have, who, rather than not glut his vengeance with the deſtruction of a few poor people, whom he reckons to be his enemies, (but who really differ from him merely for conſcience ſake), chuſes to involve himſelf, his church, and all her prieſts and people, in one common ruin with them! But this gentleman pretends to have holy ſcripture on his ſide: and thither let us now follow him.

The paſſage he refers to is Acts viii. 18, 19, 20, 21. " And " when Simon ſaw that, through laying on of hands, the " Holy Ghoſt was given, he offered them money, ſaying, Give " me

" me alſo this power, that on whomſoever I lay my hands, he may " receive the Holy Ghoſt. But Peter ſaid unto him, Thy mo- " ney periſh with thee, becauſe thou haſt thought that the gift " of God may be purchaſed with money: Thou haſt neither " part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the " ſight of God." From theſe words, my learned adverſary deſcribes Simony " to be an offer of money for obtaining *holy* " *orders*, which exceeds (ſays he) in malignity every other in- " ſtance of irregularity and uncanonicalneſs, and is an abſolute " bar, by the ſentence of an inſpired apoſtle, upon having any " part or lot in the *ſpiritual gift*:" That is, according to the Rebuffer, a perſon ordained through the influence of money, is no more a clergyman than if hands had never been laid upon him. But do the words he alludes to, and which are juſt now quoted, warrant him to ſay ſo? and particularly, does the ſacred text itſelf ſay ſo? No, by no means. It ſays indeed, that the impoſtor offered the apoſtles money, that they might confer on him the power of conveying the Holy Ghoſt to others; but it does not tell us what means he expected the apoſtles were to make uſe of in orderto convey that gift to him: nor does the text ſay, that offering money was " an effectual bar upon having any part or " lot in the *ſpiritual gift*," that is, as the Rebuffer explains theſe words, in holy orders; but only, that Magus had no part or lot ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, *in ſermone noſtro*, ſays Dr Hammond; literally, in this word or doctrine; or in this matter, according to our tranſlation, the plain meaning of which is, that he had no part or lot in the Chriſtian doctrine; that is, he was not a ſincere profeſſor of Chriſtianity, but a hypocrite, becauſe his heart, as the apoſtle adds, was not right in the ſight of God. How this learned gentleman has tranſlated λόγῳ τούτῳ the *ſpiritual gift*, let him tell; but I preſume he will not have the countenance of many Greek ſcholars for that liberty. The truth is, Simon Magus neither believed in the Holy Ghoſt as a divine perſon, nor holy orders to be a divine inſtitution; nor, in ſhort, did he credit one word of Chriſtianity, but looked upon the apoſtles as arrant cheats like himſelf, mere magicians, but better ſkilled in the diabolical art than he. For though he *pretended* to believe, and even was baptized, it was only in hopes of being thereby initiated into what he reckoned the deepeſt myſteries of magic. This is the opinion of Dr Whitby, Dr Hammond, and, I believe, all learned commentators of the church of England on this ſubject: and indeed is plainly deducible from the words of the apoſtle. And hence it appears, that though offering money for ſpiritual offices and places has been by *analogy called* Simony, and very juſtly condemned by the Chriſtian church, " yet (as Dr Whitby ſays), " it is a crime of a very different, and, I may add, a very infe-

" rior nature to that of this impoſtor," which conſiſted, as the ſame great divine, and others obſerve, " not ſo much in his am-
" bition and avarice, and a deſire of being advanced to the
" *higheſt dignity*; as in this, that he ſtruck at the very founda-
" tion of the Chriſtian faith, ſuppoſing that the apoſtles and
" other Chriſtians did their miracles for the confirmation of it,
" by ſome higher art of magic than what he had learned, and
" by the ſame art could teach others to do the ſame works for
" any other end." So that it was not holy orders which the wicked Simon either wanted or expected, as the Rebuffer ridiculouſly affirms, (without the leaſt authority from ſacred writ), but a greater ſkill in the art of magic. And that being the caſe, it was no wonder if St Peter told him, that without repentance his money ſhould periſh with him, ſeeing he wickedly ſuppoſed that the Holy Spirit could be bribed, or at leaſt, would countenance bribery in his apoſtle. But becauſe St Peter declared, that the impoſtor could not purchaſe the miraculous gifts of the divine ſpirit himſelf, nor the power of conferring them on others, does it therefore follow, that a commiſſion to be a miniſter, which conveys *no ſupernatural* powers, nor always, I fear, even the *ordinary* gifts or *graces* of the Spirit, cannot be conferred upon a man who *offers* money, nor *given* by one who receives it? By no means: becauſe the caſes are widely different. To be convinced of this, the reader will pleaſe to recollect, that our bleſſed Saviour never appointed any fixed method, whereby the apoſtles might empower their converts to convey the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Ghoſt to others; and therefore he was not obliged, in virtue of any promiſe, to confer thoſe gifts, except when and how he pleaſed. And hence it came to paſs, that though we have reaſon to believe the apoſtles laid their hands on all Chriſtians for confirmation; yet all did not ſpeak with tongues, nor did all work miracles, nor all prophecy, as St Paul tells us; far leſs did all who received the Holy Ghoſt themſelves, receive alſo a power of conveying him to other people; but he came upon every one, and divided to every one, his *ſupernatural gifts*, ſeverally, not as the apoſtles, but as he himſelf willed: whereas our bleſſed Lord *gave an expreſs commiſſion* to his apoſtles to ſend other biſhops and prieſts as he was ſent by his Father, and *promiſed* to be with *them who were thus ſent* in the exerciſe of their ſpiritual functions, even *unto the end of the world*; without any intimation that the evil diſpoſitions of the receivers hearts ſhould be any bar to their commiſſion. For which reaſon, our bleſſed Saviour is obliged, in virtue of that promiſe, to grant *his* warrant and authority to thoſe who are Epiſcopally ordained; even though money ſhould be *offered*, and alſo *taken* for the impoſition of hands. For holy orders are not a ſpiritual gift in the

ſame

ſame ſenſe as ſupernatural powers, or even the ordinary graces or virtues of the goſpel are; becauſe they do not convey at any time, now-a-days, the firſt, nor are they always accompanied, as before obſerved, even with the ſecond; otherwiſe no lawfully-ordained clergyman could be a bad man, which, alas! but too often happens. But holy orders are only a *ſpiritual gift*, in this ſenſe, that they convey a power from the Spirit of God, the Vicegerent of Chriſt, to miniſter in his ſpiritual kingdom; juſt as a commiſſion from a king to be a general makes a ſoldier a commander, though he has neither the abilities nor the virtues which properly belong to that office. And therefore, though Simon Magus could not poſſibly receive, in conſequence of his impious offer, the power of beſtowing the Holy Ghoſt on whom he pleaſed; becauſe the divine Spirit could not have conferred that power upon him, without countenancing the ſordid views of the impoſtor, and given a fatal blow to the Chriſtian religion; yet had he really deſired the ſupreme dignity, and Judas had been alive to have conferred it on him, I have no difficulty in affirming, that by Judas's ordination, Simon would have been as lawful a biſhop as Hophni and Phinehas, ſons of Eli, were lawful prieſts, or Judas himſelf a rightful apoſtle. To no purpoſe, therefore, has the Rebuffer wreſted this paſſage of ſcripture to favour his opinion; for in fact no ſuch conſequences as he has drawn, can fairly be deduced from it. It is a vain opinion, it is a falſe opinion, perfectly unknown in the primitive times, nor ever received by the church of England. In ſhort, the Rebuffer ſtands in this caſe, if not entirely, yet almoſt alone; and may be ſaid, without any great miſtake, to be like Athanaſius, though in a very different cauſe, againſt the whole world.

The next thing to be conſidered is the eighth canon of the firſt council of Nice.

The Remarker on the Rebuffer's firſt performance had obſerved, that that great and reſpectable council, having received the Novatian clergy, without new orders, behoved, by parity of reaſon, to be of opinion, that Simony does not invalidate a biſhop's conſecration. In anſwer to which, the Rebuffer, p. 92. firſt charges the Remarker with having actually ſaid, that Novatian's conſecrators were bribed, when he only ſaid that they were filled *drunk*, if not bribed; and then, after fighting for a while with a man of ſtraw of his own making, he offers this powerful argument, the ſum of all he has to ſay on this topic, that if Caranza does not deceive him, the canon referred to did order the Novatian clergy to be re-ordained. Now, not to inſiſt that the Rebuffer's edition of Caranza's works is contradicted by the Geneva edition, which gives a very different turn to that canon; not to inſiſt, that the different parts of the canon are manifeſtly ſet

at

at variance among themſelves, by his tranſlation; I would fain aſk the Rebuffer, Why ſo learned a hiſtorian as he pretends to be, ſhould truſt to any tranſlation, and not have recourſe to the original, in order to confute his adverſary? If the Nicene canons in Greek are not in his own library, how eaſy a matter was it to get a tranſcript of the eighth canon from the advocate's library in Edinburgh? or if any tranſlation was to be relied upon, might it not have been expected, that ſo zealous a Proteſtant would have preferred the great Biſhop Beveridge, or Mr Johnſon's verſions, to that of a perſecuting Papiſt, ſeeing they were eminent members of his own communion, and two of the beſt ſcholars and beſt clergymen the Revolution church of England ever bred? Surely, when one reflects, that this zealous Rebuffer has declared Popery to be *worſe than Heatheniſm*, p. 69. and ſo cannot lay great ſtreſs upon the teſtimony of a bigotted Roman Catholic, in oppoſition to two of the greateſt ornaments of his own church; it but too clearly ſhews, that he was glad of even the *ſemblance* of evidence to ſupport a malicious calumny, and muſt convince every unprejudiced perſon, that ſcandal is his delight. Meantime, whatever may be in that matter, I ſhall here give an exact tranſlation of the whole canon; and ſhall ſubjoin as much of the original as is ſufficient to ſhew clearly the deſign of it; and then ſhall leave it to the reader to judge on whoſe ſide the truth lies. "Concerning thoſe who formerly called themſelves *Puritans*, or the Pure Ones, but have or ſhall come over to the Catholic church, it ſeemeth meet to the holy and great ſynod, that they who have *received impoſition of hands*, or are *ordained*, remain ſo among the clergy. It is proper however, that before all things, they profeſs by writing, that they will embrace and follow the doctrine of the Catholic church; that is, will communicate with perſons twice married, and thoſe that in time of perſecution, have fallen into idolatry, concerning whom or whoſe repentance ſet times and ſpaces are determined and fixed; ſo that they will follow the dictates of the Catholic and Apoſtolic church in all things. All of them therefore, whatſoever, whether in villages or cities, *if they only are found ordained*, they who *are found in the clergy, ſhall be* (*or continue*) *in the ſame rank or order*. But if any of them ſhall come over, where there is a biſhop or preſbyter of the Catholic church ſettled, it is clear, that the biſhop of the church ſhall in that place have the dignity of biſhop. And he who was called biſhop by the Novatians, ſhall enjoy the honour of the preſbyterate; unleſs it pleaſe the Catholic biſhop to honour him with the name of biſhop alſo. But if this does not pleaſe him, (*i. e.* the Catholic biſhop), let him provide for him, (*i. e.* for the Novatian biſhop), the place

"of

" of a Chorepiſcopus, *i. e.* a village biſhop, or of preſbyter; that " ſo he may by all means be among the clergy, and that there " may not be two biſhops in one city." Here follows the Greek, as far as is neceſſary to ſhew the ſenſe of the canon, taken from Harduin's Paris laſt edition of the Ancient Councils, in twelve volumes folio, which by the by agrees with Biſhop Beveridge. Περι τῶν ὀνομαζονλῶν μεν ἑαυλὺς καθαρως ποτε, προσιρχομένων δε τῇ καθολίκη εκκλησίᾳ, ἐδοξε τη ἁγιᾳ και μεγαλη συνόδω, ὡσε χειροθετυμένυς ἀυλῦς, μένειν ὕλως ἐν τῶ κλήρω— ἔνθα μὲν ὦν πάνλες, ἤιλε ἐν κώμαις ἤιλε ἐν πόλεσιν ἄυλοι μόνοι ἐυρίσκοινλο χειρολονηθένλες, οι ἐυρισκόμενοι ἐν τῶ κλήρω, ἴσονλαι ἐν το ἀυλῶ χήμαλι— ἐι δε τνλο ἀυλῶ μὴ ἀρέσκοι, ἐπινοήσαι τόπον ὁ χωρεπίσκοπυ, ὁ πρισβυλέρυ ὕπερ τῦ ἐν τω κλήρω ὅλως δοκῆν εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τὰ πολει, δυο ἐπίσκοποι ωσιν.—Now, that by this canon the Novatian clergy were not to be re-ordained, will be obvious, I imagine, from the following conſiderations.

1*ſt*, That the word χειροθετυμένυς is a participle paſſive preſent, indicates, that their ordination was already over: for if the council had intended that they ſhould have new orders, I preſume they would have made uſe either of the infinitive paſſive, or the future participle.

2*dly*, This appears from the uſe of the word μένειν, *continue* among the clergy: for this ſuppoſes that they were clergymen before; whereas, if the council had ordered them to be re-ordained, it raiſed them to a dignity which, in their judgement, they had not before; and ſo could not in common ſenſe ſay, that they were to *remain in*, but were to be *promoted to*, the rank of clergy. But this, if poſſible, is ſtill clearer,

3*dly*, From that part of the canon which decrees, " That in " whatſoever village or city the Novatians ſhall be found to be " the only *ordained* perſons, that is, where there is no biſhop or " prieſt of the Catholic church, there the Novatian biſhop or prieſt " ſhall remain in the ſame rank or order:" for this expreſsly ſuppoſes, 1*ſt*, that in the judgement of this council, the Novatians were *really ordained*; and, 2*dly*, that they had no occaſion for new orders, but were to be received into the church in the ſame rank or character which they had held in the ſchiſm. The reaſon of which was, as Mr Johnſon (after Balſamon, Zonaras, Ariſtenus, Biſhop Beveridge, Rogerus, Bernardus, Van Ephen; and Suicerus, in his *Theſaurus Eccleſiaſticus*, under the word χειροθεσία,) tells us, that the Novatians were not only ſound in the faith, but had Epiſcopal ordination; and therefore had no occaſion for new orders.

Finally, this appears from the anxiety the council diſcovers for their continuing in the clergy; That by all means, ſays the canon, they may, (not *ſeem to be*, but may really) be among the clergy; for δοκειν, in eccleſiaſtical language, is generally an expletive;

tive; as might be ſhewn by numberleſs inſtances out of the New Teſtament, if it were neceſſary.

In ſhort, tho' there is no doubt but the Novatians, both clergy and laity, were received to the peace of the church by impoſition of hands, as all heretics and ſchiſmatics of every denomination were; and though the canon may perhaps be conſtrued to imply ſo much, yet it is manifeſt, from the whole ſcope of it, as well as as the above learned and judicious commentators, that new orders were never ſo much as thought of. And if not, then the Remarker's concluſion from the conduct of this great council ſtands firm and ſure, namely, that orders from biſhops Simoniacally promoted, are good and valid; ſeeing the Novatian clergy were not reordained, although the head of that party was promoted by means more ſcandalous, more indecent, and no leſs criminal, than even bribery is.

And now, ſeeing it has been clearly made appear, that the crime of Simon Magus was very different from Simony, in the modern ſenſe of the word; and ſince it is no leſs plain, both from holy ſcripture, and the canons of the firſt great council, that this laſt crime does not incapacitate for holy orders, it matters not a farthing, whether the charge againſt Dr Rattray and Biſhop Dunbar can be made good or not: becauſe, though guilty, it could hurt only their perſonal characters, but in no ſhape affect the miſſion of their innocent ſucceſſors. However, happily, the evidence that has hitherto appeared even againſt them, is ſo ſlender, that were Simony a capital crime, it would not ſubject them to the ſmaileſt penalty. For hearſay evidence is admitted in no court of juſtice in a cauſe worth ſixpence; and no better evidence has this bold defamer brought againſt the worthy gentlemen he has accuſed: for though he mentions ſeveral names, yet all centers at laſt in Biſhop Ouchterlonie; nor does he pretend to ſay, that he was certain of their guilt from his own particular knowledge, but collects it from words in a letter, *viz. great offers*, of doubtful meaning, which may bear a very ſound ſenſe, and probably had no reference to thoſe gentlemen's conſecrations, but to a very different buſineſs, as ſhall be ſhewn hereafter. Meantime, however that may be, I am ſorry to obſerve, that never was there a more inſufficient witneſs of a fact which he did not ſee with his own eyes, than Mr Ouchterlonie; becauſe never perhaps was there a more credulous, nor more illiterate man advanced to the ſupreme dignity. The Rebuffer would fain draw a reſemblance between Cornelius Biſhop of Rome, and that gentleman his friend; but in no one feature, except that they were both biſhops, does the likeneſs hit. For Cornelius was not only promoted canonically to the ſee of Rome, but was one of the greateſt and worthieſt men of the age in which

which he lived, as St Cyprian clearly teſtifies: whereas it can be proved by written evidence, and is known to living witneſſes, that Mr Ouchterlonie was promoted not only in oppoſition to all the provincial biſhops at that time in Scotland, and againſt the proteſt of about twenty preſbyters, who offered to ſhew cauſe why he ſhould not be promoted, and were not heard; but in direct oppoſition alſo to Biſhop Fullerton, then acknowledged metropolitan; who, when Biſhop Freebairn conſulted him, diſcharged him to conſecrate *Mr Ouchterlonie by name*, till his character was cleared up. Nay, what, if poſſible, bears ſtill harder on Mr Ouchterlonie, good Biſhop Cant, who had been overperſuaded to concur in his promotion, no ſooner laid his hands upon him, than he repented in duſt and aſhes. This appears from an holograph letter of his to Biſhop Millar, only three or four days after Mr Ouchterlonie's conſecration, which I have ſeen, and can produce; wherein he regrets his having a hand in his promotion, as the worſt action of his life.

It is with great regret, that I have been obliged to lay open this poor gentleman's failings: for I could have wiſhed they had been buried in the grave with him, and conſigned over to perpetual oblivion. But the Rebuffer muſt place this expoſure of his friend, to his own account, as well as other matters: becauſe, having ſupported a malicious calumny againſt worthier and better men, chiefly by his evidence, it became neceſſary to ſhew how little it is to be relied upon. I know well, and reverence highly the piety of the old ſaying, *De mortuis, nil niſi bonum:* but it is applicable to thoſe only who *unneceſſarily reveal*, not to them who in defence of injured innocence, are *obliged* to expoſe their neighbour's faults. And there is another maxim equally ſacred, which will not only bear me out, but which makes it a duty to ſay this much; *Fiat juſtitia, pereat mundus.* Let *juſtice be done*, though not only a ſingle perſon ſhould ſuffer, but though the whole world go to ruin by it. As for the church, if there was one traitor among twelve apoſtles, it need be no wonder, and we need not be much aſhamed, that there was one, or even more, illiterate, irregular, and even falſe brother, among ſo many of our clergy. Let me add, that there is one circumſtance, which muſt convince every reaſonable perſon of the great difference between Cornelius's teſtimony concerning Novatians ſtory, and Mr Ouchterlonie's againſt Biſhop Rattray, however much the Rebuffer may chuſe to confound them; and that is, that the charge againſt Novatian was univerſally believed at the time when the affair happened, (ſee St Cyprian's Epiſtles on that ſubject), and has been handed down, as an undoubted fact, by the beſt hiſtorians in all ages: Whereas, ſo light in the ſcale was Mr Ouchterlonie's evidence againſt Biſhop Rattray, that not one of a

thouſand at the time ever believed the malicious ſtory againſt him; nor, I am perſuaded, will yet believe it, though it has got the ſanction of the Rebuffer, and ſhould get the ſanction of fifty ſuch as he. No: Biſhop Rattray's memory will be dear to every lover of truth and genuine Chriſtianity, while there is an Epiſcopal church in Scotland regardful of celebrating the divine ſacrament of the Lord's Supper, as the church of England enjoins all her children to celebrate it; I mean, as *our Saviour Chriſt commanded, and the good fathers of the primitive church frequented it*, (Homily on the Lord's Supper, part 1.) whereas the memory of Norman Sievewright will either periſh for ever, or be remembered with abhorrence. By the by, the reader will perceive how highly the church of England venerates the primitive fathers, ſeeing ſhe commands her prieſts to celebrate the holy Euchariſt as *they frequented* it; whereas the Rebuffer ridicules thoſe venerable ſages, deſpiſes their authority, and even declares their invocation of the Holy Spirit on the ſacramental elements to be blaſphemy! How pious and dutiful a ſon of the church of England is this! and how highly to be eſteemed by all who reverence the injunctions of their holy mother! But to return. That the clergy of Fife did make propoſals, through Mr Morrice, to Biſhop Roſs, to become their proper biſhop, and that Lord Dun interpoſed his good offices alſo, I believe is true; but that malice itſelf can hardly fix the ſtain of Simony on theſe propoſals, will appear from the following copy of them, taken from an original in Mr Morrice's own hand. Mr Morrice was inſtructed by his brethren to ſtipulate with Biſhop Roſs, 1*mo*, "That he ſhall not go into "the meaſures of the college, to ſupport them, in caſe they "ſhould attack us, or the clergy in any other diſtrict: but he "ſhall before hand, at our ſight, write to Mr Gadderer, for "ſettling a correſpondence with him, as the only local biſhop "beſide the biſhop of Edinburgh; and that he ſhall concur with "the ſaid Biſhop Gadderer, and biſhop of Edinburgh, in ſup-"porting and exerciſing their authority as local biſhops, regard-"ing ſuch only as the provincial biſhops of this church who are "canonically elected and inducted into diſtricts; and that in "oppoſition to all ſuch as are not ſo inducted, who may claim "authority in this church, if they ſhall give occaſion to diſclaim "their pretended right, by endeavouring to exerciſe it.

2*do*, "That as he ſhall not take ſeparate meaſures from the "above-mentioned biſhops, ſo he ſhall govern us by the joint "advice of his clergy, and ſhall not go into any meaſures with "thoſe who are not local and provincial biſhops, nor ſhall do any "thing to infringe the concordate already made.

3*tio*, "That in caſe of a biſhop's being elected by the preſ-"byters to any diſtrict in this nation, and application made for "the

" the confirmation thereof, and his conſecration, he ſhall, with-
" out regard to thoſe who are not local biſhops, concur with
" the local and provincial biſhops, in ſuſtaining the right of the
" clergy in elections; and where no valid objection is made
" againſt the perſon elected, he ſhall be ready to concur with
" the ſaid lawful biſhops, in the conſecration and inducting him
" to the diſtrict.

4*to*, " To ſuggeſt to him the benefit that will redound to
" this church in general, and to himſelf and us in particular,
" in caſe of his accepting the government of us, and exerciſing
" it according to theſe conditions and meaſures; and that from
" the juſt power of the provincial biſhops being reſtored and
" duly exerciſed independent of others, and alſo from the en-
" couragement which he may depend on both from clergy and
" laity.

5*to*, " To ſee that the above letter to Biſhop Gadderer do
" expreſsly bear, that he ſhall ſtill act in concert with him; and
" to get him likewiſe to promiſe, in caſe of the biſhop of Edin-
" burgh's being moved by any biſhops at large, to do any thing
" raſhly, he ſhall keep in unity with Biſhop Gadderer; that
" they two, making a joint repreſentation of the caſe to
" him, may get him to come over to them." Theſe were the terms propoſed to Biſhop Roſs in the name of the clergy of Fife; theſe the offers which the Rebuffer conſtrues to be Simoniacal offers! and yet the vindicater will venture to ſay, they are ſuch as might have been made by the worthieſt ſons of the church in the pureſt and beſt of times. Biſhop Roſs had been unhappily engaged with a ſet of men, who preſumed to uſurp a power over this national church, contrary to all the laws eſtabliſhed for the preſervation of diſcipline and order in the kingdom of our bleſſed Lord; and as he was a peaceable, and, in the main, a worthy man, it was not only proper, but it was pious, to reconcile him if poſſible to his duty, and even to make it his intereſt to come over to the right ſide: for thus it is that Almighty God dealeth with ourſelves, connecting our duty ſo inſeparably with our happineſs, that it is impoſſible to purſue the one, without being certain of partaking of the other. Suppoſe therefore, that the words " encouragement which he may de-
" pend upon both from clergy and laity," in the above propoſals, ſhould be conſtrued to imply an annual contribution, to enable Biſhop Roſs (in the event of his becoming their proper dioceſan) to ſupport his high character with the greater dignity and decency; as the honeſt man had a numerous family, and a very ſcanty income, it was no more, I apprehend, than clergy and laity might openly avow, and can well be warranted by the higheſt authority. The Jewiſh prieſts, by the ſpecial appointment

of God himſelf, contributed yearly a tenth of their own tithe for the ſupport of their high-prieſt: and what they gave by command, Chriſtian prieſts and people may certainly give as a free-will-offering; nor will any perſon who has the leaſt grain of that heavenly virtue, which thinketh no evil, nay, who has the leaſt grain of common ſenſe, harbour any ſuſpicion of criminality in this caſe; becauſe, ſuppoſe Lord Dun (whoſe unſpoted virtue and rigid integrity was incapable of a dirty job) out of the queſtion, it is highly improbable, nay, it is morally impoſſible, that ten or a dozen clergymen in one dioceſe, of good underſtanding, and untainted characters, not to mention laity, ſhould avowedly agree together in ſo heinous and ſcandalous a crime as Simony is. Indeed, to offer a bribe in any caſe, but eſpecially a Simoniacal bribe to confer orders, is ſo diſreputable a crime, that I dare ſay it has ſeldom been committed in the enlightened ages of the church; and never, except by the worſt of men, and by ſingle perſons in great ſecrecy: And therefore, to ſuppoſe that *numbers* of clergymen ſhould concur in it, exceeds all belief; and will be ſwallowed down by none but thoſe who, by the depravity of their own hearts, judge thoſe of other people. And if this part of the accuſation be improbable, it is obvious, that that which reſpects Biſhop Millar is much more ſo; becauſe it ſuppoſes ſtill greater numbers to be concerned, and many of theſe of the laity too. For, ſays the Rebuffer, p. 94. "Biſhop Millar "was prevailed on to accept the bribe; and the perſons who "collected and contributed to make it up, were *known* to have "done ſo, of whom a good many were alive in the beginning "of July 1740, and the money lodged in proper hands at Dun-"dee." Now, ſurely, if a good many who collected and contributed to make up that bribe, were alive at the diſtance of thirteen years, a great many muſt at firſt have been concerned in it; and ſo this crime, which the moſt abandoned of men only practiſe in a corner, muſt have been openly and avowedly tranſacted, and as it were in the face of the ſun; *credat Judæus Apella!* Well: let us ſuppoſe for once, that Biſhop Rattray and his friends had caſt off all regard for decency and prudence, as well as religion, on this occaſion; if this was ſo, it will be at leaſt acknowledged, that the college biſhops, who were for ſome weeks at that time in and about Edinburgh, muſt have been certain of the fact: and if they were, it cannot be doubted but that in their private correſpondence with Biſhop Millar, they would have accuſed him in direct terms; eſpecially if he had been previouſly attacked upon the ſubject by Biſhop Ouchterlonie without giving ſatisfaction, as the Rebuffer tells us. And yet though I have ſeen ſeveral original letters to Biſhop Millar from the college as a body, and from Biſhop Ouchterlonie in particular

particular; and more eſpecially two, one from the college, June 24. 1727, the other from Biſhop Ouchterlonie, June 26. that ſame year, juſt two days before the famous ſynod which cenſured him, there is not the leaſt hint of Simony in either of them; nor that there was any other irregularity in Biſhop Rattray's and Biſhop Dunbar's conſecrations, except that they were done without their conſent, and wanted a certain perſon's authority: which laſt, I preſume, will be no fault to the Rebuffer, and I aſſure him was no defect in my eyes. Suppoſe therefore, I ſay, that we ſhould believe, that out of regard to thoſe perſons of diſtinction, who, the Rebuffer tells us, compounded the affair with Biſhop Millar, the college had omitted to mention the Simony expreſsly in their public deed of ſuſpenſion; yet is it poſſible to believe, that when they were dealing in *private* with their brother, to bring him to a ſenſe of his duty, and when they mentioned ſeveral, in compariſon, trivial offences, they ſhould neglect to touch upon that *capital crime*, which, if the Rebuffer is to be truſted, was the principal cauſe of their cenſure, and of all others was the moſt likely to touch his heart with compunction, and cover him with confuſion? No, it is beyond all credibility; and it is ſtill more improbable, that, if they had believed it to be true, they would have offered to acquit him, and receive Biſhops Rattray and Dunbar without the leaſt cenſure, providing they agreed to acknowledge their authority, and give up the uſages. Yet, in fact, this they did; for in their letter above mentioned, of June 24. 1727, to Biſhop Millar, they offer to confirm his right to the ſee of Edinburgh; and of Biſhops Rattray and Dunbar they ſay, "we ſhall be heartily glad to embrace them as our colleagues, and biſhops of this national church, and to allow them diſtricts." Signed, Al. Duncan, David Freebairn, Ja. Roſe, Jo. Ouchterlonie, Dav. Ranken, Jo. Gillan. I may add, that if they had believed the Simony, the loweſt puniſhment they could have inflicted, both on the conſecrator and and the conſecrated, agreeable to the canons of the univerſal church, was depoſition; and yet they only ſuſpended Biſhop Millar, and no one elſe. They paſſed no cenſure on Biſhop Cant, or on Biſhop Keith; nor did they deny Biſhops Rattray and Dunbar to be true and rightful biſhops, I mean, that they had valid orders, far leſs did they pretend to depoſe or ſuſpend them; but only declared, that their conſecrations were irregular, and that they had no title to juriſdiction within this national church, becauſe forſooth they were promoted without their conſent. From all which it is evident, that the college biſhops themſelves didnot at that time believe the ſtory of the Simony. Indeed, when it is conſidered, that the late Earl of Panmure and John Lord Balmerino were the perſons employed to bring over Biſhop Millar,

Millar, as Lord Dun had attempted to reconcile Biſhop Roſs, the very name of ſuch perſons of worth and honour is ſufficient to ſtifle the din of infamous clamour, and to condemn this ſcurrilous tongue to everlaſting ſilence. The Rebuffer is ſo far honeſt, it is true, that he acknowledges ſome *perſons of diſtinction* compounded the affair with Biſhop Millar, becauſe he was obliged to aſſign ſome ſhadow of reaſon at leaſt, why that gentleman's ſentence of ſuſpenſion did not proceed upon the Simony: but he is honeſt only in part, as he conceals the perſons names who were thus concerned; well knowing, that gentlemen of ſuch acknowledged virtue, and ſuch uncommon merit, could not be mentioned as active in an infamous affair, with the leaſt probability of being believed. Indeed, they were as much ſuperior to the ordinary rate of Chriſtians in the ſanctity of their manners, as by their dignities they were exalted above the common maſs of mankind. And therefore, had the clergy been wicked enough to engage in Simony themſelves, they durſt not have preſumed ſo much as to name it to thoſe noblemen. By the by: Biſhop Keith being conſecrated June 18. and Biſhop Millar not being ſuſpended till June 28. the ſame year, it is plain, that the Rebuffer's objection to Mr Keith's ordination, *viz.* That it was while Biſhop Millar was under ſuſpenſion, is falſe, and without foundation; and ſo, I hope, our orders are derived from one Biſhop at leaſt whoſe conſecration was valid. I think I may ſay, from two; becauſe Biſhop Dunbar was conſecrated the ſame day with Biſhop Keith: and therefore, unleſs Biſhop Millar was twice bribed; once when he conſecrated Biſhop Rattray, June 4. and again June the 18th, neither Biſhop Dunbar nor Biſhop Keith's were Simoniacally obtained. As to what the Rebuffer ſays of Mr Ouchterlonie's accuſing Biſhop Millar in his own houſe, and that he did not pretend to deny the fact, if there was any truth in that ſtory, which I very much doubt, I am perſuaded that Biſhop Millar has acted that part from a conſciouſneſs of his innocence, and a contempt of the accuſation. That he was a man of ſenſe and ſpirit, ſeveral holograph letters ſtill extant, and particularly his reply to the college letter of the 24th June before mentioned, ſufficiently evince. And that a man of ſpirit would naturally diſdain to give a reply to ſo infamous an attack upon his character, is confirmed by what we ſee every day happen. I remember one inſtance particularly, in the caſe of a lady, of whoſe innocence, I believe, the world now is generally very well ſatisfied; who, to one that inſolently queſtioned the birth of her ſon, ſcorned to make any anſwer. And I am poſitive, that were I attacked as Biſhop Millar was, I ſhould make no other reply, but turn the accuſer to the door. After all, as Biſhop Millar left his widow and children in very diſtreſſed

diſtreſſed circumſtances, it is more than probable, that he was ſtraitened alſo in his lifetime; and if any collection was made for him among the well wiſhers of the primitive form of government and ancient uſages, (of which, by the by, I know nothing, except what I conjecture from the Rebuffer's account of the matter), this would give the other party a handle to ſay, that what was really an act of charity, was given as a bribe. Meantime, whatever Biſhop Ouchterlonie might ſay of Biſhop Rattray, while the ſpirit of faction prevailed, I am certain, from his letters to that gentleman long afterwards, which are ſtill extant, that he muſt either have changed his mind, or have been the moſt accompliſhed hypocrite: and whatever the Rebuffer, and men of his caſt, may now ſay, and whatever they may do, to blacken Biſhop Rattray's memory, his character will ſtand the teſt againſt their impotent malice, and, like the ſun after an eclipſe, ſhine out with the greater luſtre. For the Rebuffer has no letters of Biſhop Rattray's, of which there are not authentic duplicates in ſafe cuſtody; nor is it in his power to accuſe that gentleman's conduct in any one inſtance which cannot, and will not be juſtified before the world: So that let the Rebuffer, if he pleaſes, attack it an hundred times, it will be as often defended by one who knows more of the true and real hiſtory of that period than he does; and his malice will be made to recoil upon his own head; or at leaſt be made apparent to all mankind. To what is here urged in defence of Biſhops Rattray and Dunbar, let the reader add what the author of the letter from Edinburgh formerly delivered on the ſame ſubject, from the 20th to the 29th page, and then let him believe the ſtory of the Simony if he can.

But it is now time to proceed to Biſhop White's conſecration. Now, in the *firſt* place, he ſays, p. 67. that Biſhop Freebairn's metropolitical juriſdiction was acknowledged; and again, p. 109. 110. that at Biſhops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith's deſire, "he had called a ſynodical meeting, June 18. 1735; "and yet that they refuſed to come to this meeting, which "they themſelves had ſolicited, unleſs he would implicitly "follow their directions; That he would not agree to this, "ſo the uſagemen took their own method." Now, though the Rebuffer has been pleaſed to ſay, that he has his information from the letters that paſſed on that occaſion between the two old biſhops and the uſagers; yet I confidently affirm, and from the very ſame authority, that part of his account is abſolutely falſe, and the reſt moſt groſsly miſrepreſented. Firſt, I ſay, it is abſolutely falſe that Biſhop Freebairn was acknowledged as metropolitan, or could be acknowledged by either ſide, conſiſtently with the joint deed both of uſagers and anti-

uſagers,

uſagers, at the concordate 1731. For thereby it was not only ſtipulated, that the metropolitical powers *ſhould be laid aſide*, and a temporary *Primus*, with the power only of convocating and preſiding, choſen in the room of metropolitans; but it was made a *previous condition by Biſhop Freebairn in particular*, that the *metropolitical powers ſhould be laid aſide*, without which he declared he would enter into no terms of peace. Nay, ſo averſe was Biſhop Freebairn to thoſe powers, that though he ſat and voted in the meeting which choſe Mr Lumiſden Biſhop of Edinburgh, yet he refuſed to acknowledge that gentleman as Biſhop of Edinburgh, though elected by a free and fair majority; *becauſe he claimed the metropolitical powers*, which then were believed to belong to his ſee as Vicar-general of St Andrews. I add farther, that not only was the metropolitical juriſdiction laid aſide at the concordate, but it appears by the teſtimony of Biſhops Rattray, Keith, and Gillan, that Biſhop Freebairn accepted of the primacy, upon this expreſs condition, of being determined even as to *convocating by the majority*. Nay, ſo much is plainly implied in his own letter to Biſhops Dunbar and Rattray; the firſt dated Jan. 22. 1734, wherein he has theſe words: "Whatever error "they [the biſhops] ſhall find in my conduct, *I ſhall ſubmit to* "*their cenſure, even though I were a metropolitan, which I will* "*never be.* I leave that to thoſe of aſpiring humours, who love "to command in chief." And in a letter to Biſhop Rattray, October 3. 1734, he acknowledges, that it was agreed upon in the conferences previous to the concordate 1731, that if the majority of biſhops at any time required a ſynod, it was the duty of the Primus to comply with their deſire. So far with reſpect to the falſe part of the Rebuffer's account, *viz.* that Biſhop Freebairn's metropolitical juriſdiction was acknowledged. I ſay farther, that he has groſsly miſrepreſented the reſt of it. For though it be true, that, Biſhops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, deſired the Primus to call a meeting, as the Remarker obſerved; yet it is as true, that according to the powers veſted in them as the majority, they ſpecified, in all their letters, the *particular reaſon* for which they wanted that ſynod to be called; namely, for the ſole purpoſe of conſecrating Biſhop White. And it is no leſs true, that though Biſhop Freebairn did call a meeting according to the deſire of his brethren, yet he neither invited the biſhop elect to it himſelf, nor did he deſire any other biſhop to intimate it to him; and conſequently, it is plain he did not intend to do the buſineſs for which the ſynod was deſired; but wanted it for ſome other by-purpoſe of his own. Indeed Biſhops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, had undoubted information, that inſtead of deſigning to conſecrate Biſhop White, as they required, his ſole intention in calling a meeting, was to lay before them certain MSS.

MSS. which it was neither proper nor prudent for them to look into; and therefore, by their letter of June 10. 1735, they wiſely refuſed to meet with Biſhop Freebairn in Edinbutgh, except for the ſole purpoſe of conſecrating Biſhop White; and they *juſtly* refuſed to do ſo, becauſe, being the majority, the whole power of adminiſtration, and even of convocating, as has been made appear already, was lodged in their hands. In ſhort, upon Biſhop Freebairn's refuſing to obey the commands of the majority, according to agreement, and the ſenſe of his own letter juſt now quoted, they met by themſelves, and conſecrated Biſhop White; and in doing ſo, it is obvious they were fully warranted.

And now having finiſhed what I propoſed in anſwer to the Rebuff: having ſhewn how dioceſan Epiſcopacy, the only lawful form of eccleſiaſtical government, was continued in Scotland after the Revolution, until the death of Dr Roſe; and how it was revived again, after it had been loſt for a little: and having alſo ſhewn, that the Rebuffer's objections againſt our Epiſcopal ſucceſſion, are neither founded on holy ſcripture, or Chriſtian antiquity, nor, I think I may add, conſiſtent with common ſenſe, but deſtructive of the internal peace and happineſs both of prieſts and people, as manifeſtly tending to encourage the moſt dreadful apprehenſions and doubts about their very baptiſms: having ſhewn all this, I ſay, may it not ſtill be aſked, by what authority he miniſters among us in holy things? That he has an anſwer ready I know; which is, that his "title is confirmed by "an expreſs act of parliament. This confirms our paſtoral re-"lation (ſaith he) to our people, and authorizes our canonical "and legal miniſtrations in ſacred things, to all intents and pur-"poſes, as if we were formally collated by an immediate eccle-"ſiaſtical ſuperior." A paſtoral relation, either formed or confirmed by act of parliament, as equal to the authority of an eccleſiaſtical ſuperior, in the mouth of a Chriſtian clergyman, who believes that there is ſuch a thing as church authority, is, I think, very ſtrange language; and, I ſuppoſe, is a new diſcovery intended to grace this learned gentleman's eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. Meantime, however that may be, here at leaſt we have an honeſt confeſſion, that the Rebuffer and his brethren derive their authority for officiating in Scotland from no *eccleſiaſtical ſuperior:* agreeable to which he elſewhere acknowledges, (p. 67. of the Rebuff,) that they have inſtitution from none of the Engliſh biſhops, (and he might have ſaid, nor from any of the Iriſh biſhops), becauſe "the biſhops of England (and I ſhall add, of "Ireland) have no more power over Scotland, than they have "over Tartary." Nay, here we have an honeſt confeſſion, that Epiſcopal clergymen officiating in Scotland, as things ſtand at

preſent, *can* receive no lawful authority from any Engliſh or Iriſh biſhop; and conſequently, that though one or more of either church ſhould uſurp the power of collating to particular congregations in this country, ſuch collation would be null and void, as being given by incompetent authority; that is, by biſhops who have no more power in Scotland than in Tartary. And now, if this be ſo, and if it be alſo true, that Epiſcopacy is a divine and apoſtolical inſtitution, as the Rebuffer likewiſe acknowledges, (Principles Political and Religious), and if it be true, that every biſhop is the viſible head, and principle of unity to his own particular church, and that the inferior prieſts and people can no otherwiſe hold communion with Chriſt, the inviſible head of the whole church, than by living in union and communion with the one lawful biſhop of the dioceſe; all which was Chriſtian doctrine in the very apoſtolic age, as the Rebuffer muſt know, who has read Archbiſhop Wake's tranſlation of St Ignatius's Epiſtles, the immediate diſciple of the Apoſtle St John: Good God! in what a diſmal ſtate are the Rebuffer and his adherents? By his own confeſſion, no Engliſh or Iriſh biſhop is, or, as things juſt now ſtand, can be head of the dioceſe wherein he lives: and he glories in oppoſing the Scotch biſhop; whoſe authority however is, I think, proved in this pamphlet to be good and valid, beyond all poſſibility of reply. And what then is the conſequence? Why, that having a relation to no viſible eccleſiaſtical head, or principle of unity in the Catholic church, he cannot be in union and communion with Chriſt the inviſible head; that is, in plain terms, he and his flock are in a formal ſtate of ſchiſm; no *living* parts of the body of Chriſt, nor any otherwiſe members of it, than as a branch or a limb lopt off, are members of the tree or body from which it is cut away. And how dangerous a condition that is, he may learn from the different writings of the great Dr Hammond, Dr Sherlock, and Dr Scot, all eminent divines of the church of England; and eſpecially from the great Biſhop Pearſon, who, in his admirable expoſition of the creed, after telling us, (p. 341. edit. 8.) that there is no church where there are not the paſtoral guides ſanctified and ſet apart by the appointment of God, and conſequently no jurant church in Scotland, becauſe no biſhops, has theſe words, (p. 349, 350.) "Chriſt never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build "a church to ſave ſome, and make another inſtitution for other "mens ſalvation. As none were ſaved from the deluge, but "ſuch as were within the ark of Noah, ſo none ſhall ever eſcape "the eternal wrath of God, who belong not to the church of "God." Nay, holy ſcripture, which is of infinitely greater authority than the writings of Biſhop Pearſon, aſſures us, that it was to the *church* they were added in primitive times, who

ſhould

ſhould be ſaved, Acts xi. 47. and as all who were of the church did in the beginning adhere to the *apoſtle's doctrine and fellowſhip*, or communion, and *in breaking of bread, and in prayers*, ver. 42. ſo, ſuch as forſook the apoſtles *doctrine and fellowſhip* in thoſe days, or went out from them, are expreſsly ſaid *not to be of them*, or of their ſociety; that is, they ceaſed to be members, pure and living members, I mean, of the church. *They went out from us*, ſaith St John, 1 Epiſtle ii. 19. *but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifeſt, that they were not all of us.* Now, from theſe texts, as well as from others, particularly John xv. 4. Heb. xiii. 17. 1 Cor. xvi. 15. 16. two things are manifeſt:

1*ſt*, That Almighty God has not promiſed, and conſequently is not *obliged*, in virtue of any covenant, to ſave any perſons, except ſuch as become members of his church, and continue ſo to the end of their lives. For to the church all were added who ſhould be ſaved.

2*dly*, That profeſſed Chriſtians cannot continue members of the church, unleſs they not only adhere to the Apoſtle's *doctrine*, but to their *fellowſhip or communion alſo*, in breaking of bread, and in prayers; that is, they muſt not only believe all the articles of faith, and perform obedience to the moral law, but they muſt join in divine offices with, and receive the holy Euchariſt from *thoſe Apoſtles with whom our bleſſed Saviour has promiſed to be until the end of the world*, Mat. xxviii. 20. that is, the ſucceſſors of the twelve Apoſtles, ſtrictly ſo called, or lawful governors of the ſeveral particular churches in all ages throughout the world. For as Biſhop Pearſon has well obſerved, that God has not appointed two ways to go to heaven, but has made the church that glorious vehicle whereby all men in all places, and all ages, ſhall be carried up to that bleſſed place; ſo I may obſerve, that neither has he appointed two different ways whereby men, in different ages, may be made and continue members of his church; but as the firſt converts were made Chriſtians by the Apoſtle's baptiſm, and ſuch as they authoriſed, and continued members of the Chriſtian ſociety, by adhering not only to the Apoſtles *doctrine*, but to their *fellowſhip alſo*, in breaking of bread, and in prayers; ſo we, in later ages, muſt, in like manner, adhere to our apoſtle's doctrine and fellowſhip, in breaking of bread, and in prayers, if we wiſh to be true and living members of Chriſt's myſtical body: For to this end did our bleſſed Lord impower his apoſtles and their ſucceſſors to the end of the world, and them only, to adminiſter the bleſſed ſacraments of his death, that he might unite all his followers into one viſible ſociety, under viſible governors, and

oblige all them who wiſh to partake of the benefits of his death, to be ſubject to thoſe governors in all ſpiritual things, and obey them as being ſet over his people in the Lord. And as the Rebuffer has acknowledged Epiſcopacy to be a divine inſtitution, (Principles Political and Religious,) and conſequently, muſt own the lawful biſhops in every church to be the ſucceſſors of the apoſtles; and I have in this ſmall pamphlet irrefragably demonſtrated, by arguments that cannot be refuted upon the principles of Chriſt's Catholic church, that the biſhops at preſent in Scotland, have not only a valid miſſion derived from the ante-revolution biſhops, but real, ſpiritual, though not legal juriſdiction: therefore it follows undeniably, that they who continue in a ſtate of rebellion againſt our biſhops, and refuſe to obey them who ought to rule over them, cannot be members of the pure church of Chriſt. I mean not by this to deny ſalvation to all who are not of our church: God forbid. For who in theſe unhappy days of factions innumerable, and ſchiſms without end, in that caſe, could be ſaved? Heathens and Mahometans, who have no opportunity, cannot be under the obligation of becoming members of Chriſt's church: and of thoſe who have, nine tenths of them, for want of proper education, are incapable of unravelling that ſophiſtry wherewith able and artful clergymen of all perſuaſions diſguiſe their errors, and conceal the truth. And therefore I charitably believe, that there is mercy laid up againſt that day, for the far greateſt part both of Papiſts and Proteſtants, notwithſtanding their ſeparation from the true church. But of thoſe who knowingly and wilfully divide the flock of God, and from views of intereſt, ambition, or other ſiniſter motives, rend the myſtical body of Chriſt in pieces, I do ſay, that they ſin with a high hand, and without deep repentance cannot be forgiven. And I ſay farther, that it is of the greateſt conſequence, and what all who are capable of the inquiry will do well to take heed to, that they ſubmit themſelves to thoſe governors who, as being rightful biſhops of the dioceſe wherein they live, are therefore over them in the Lord: becauſe, without that, they cannot adhere to the *apoſtles fellowſhip*, and ſo cannot be partakers in *their* breaking of bread, and in prayers; nor, of conſequence, can they belong to *that church* to which, ordinarily ſpeaking, all muſt be added, in order that they may be ſaved. Well; but ſays the Rebuffer, "our canonical and legal miniſtrations, and our relation to our people, "are confirmed by act of parliament, equally, to all intents and "purpoſes, as if authorized by an eccleſiaſtical ſuperior." But let me aſk this learned Rebuffer, where he learnt this doctrine? Not from his Bible, I dare ſay; for, if I miſtake not, St Paul tells us, Acts xx. 28. that the paſtoral relation is formed by authority

authority from God; or that it is the Holy Ghoſt which makes clergymen overſeers of the flock of Chriſt. And if ſo, I ſhould think that the biſhop, and not the parliament, ſhould be the medium of conveyance here; becauſe, however this laſt may have the charge of men's bodies, I thought Epiſcopal people at leaſt believed, that the biſhops, and not the parliament, are appointed to watch for mens ſouls. And if this be certain, as I think it is, how is the Rebuffer ſure that an act of parliament can ſuperſede the neceſſity of a divine inſtitution? or will he riſk his own and his people's ſalvation upon that ſecurity? If he does, I pray God, that neither he nor they may be diſappointed of their hopes: but I ſolemnly aſſure him, that I would not aſſume the office of a paſtor upon an act of parliament, without Epiſcopal authority, if Epiſcopacy be a divine inſtitution, not for the whole world.

But in the mean time, ſuppoſing the authority of parliament ſufficient, is the fact true that the Rebuffer's relation to his people is confirmed by act of parliament? No; it is falſe for two reaſons: firſt, becauſe the Epiſcopal authority is neceſſary as a divine inſtitution, for forming paſtoral relations even in England, where the church is not barely tolerated as here, but expreſsly *eſtabliſhed* by act of parliament, and therefore much more, if poſſible, muſt it be neceſſary in Scotland, where Epiſcopacy is juſt permitted, and no more.

But there is another reaſon why the Rebuffer's aſſertion is falſe; which is, that if his and his brethrens relations were fixed by an expreſs act of parliament, nothing leſs than an expreſs act of parliament could diſſolve them; which yet, I preſume, neither they nor their people reckon neceſſary. No: their people, conſcious that they have no eccleſiaſtical authority, no, nor any civil authority, but what they derive from mere compact, hire them like menial ſervants, and when diſſatisfied with them, like menial ſervants turn them off.

And now, ſeeing by the Rebuffer's own confeſſion, his authority to miniſter in ſacred things, as a fixed paſtor, is not derived from any eccleſiaſtical ſuperior, and ſeeing I have clearly proved, that it is neither *formed* nor *confirmed* by any act of parliament, from what ſource he will next draw it, let him tell, for I cannot.

I have only farther to add, that if the Rebuffer thinks fit to attempt a reply to this, I expect he will keep to the main point between us; and not deſcant upon ſubjects foreign to the purpoſe. Let him not, like a ſtate pedagogue, ungenerouſly ſhake the rod of power over us; but let him come out from under the cannon of his political fort, and meet us in the fair and open field of eccleſiaſtical debate, as an eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian ought

to

to do: or, to ſpeak without a metaphor, let him argue with us like a clergyman, upon true church principles, which will ſtand the teſt in all times and ſeaſons; and then, if he comes off victorious, he will come off with honour: but if he intrenches himſelf behind the ſecular arm, and meanly endeavours to enſnare his antagoniſts, by haling unneceſſarily into the argument ſuch topicks as they can neither in prudence nor good manners openly canvaſs, it is plain, that whatever elſe he may gain, he can gain no credit to himſelf, becauſe he does not engage us upon equal terms. Let him then, in the

1*ſt* place, Shew that the church of England turned the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and other uſages, out of her liturgy, becauſe ſhe believed them, as he does, to be hereſies cendemned by the word of God: or that by any authentic deed ſhe has ſince declared, that ſhe holds ſuch practices in abhorrence, "and "that no well informed Chriſtian can allow himſelf to put up "with them, or to continue in the fellowſhip of thoſe who "have committed ſuch crimes, and perſiſt in the ſame," Principles Pol. and Rel. p. 164. And let him alſo ſhew, againſt his brother Mr Bowyer, p. 54. 55. of his True Account, againſt Hoadley's Plain Account of the Lord's Supper, that the preamble to the ſecond act of King Edward VI. anent the liturgy, which declared the uſages to be agreeable to the word of God and the primitive church, is not yet in force. And if it be, let him ſhew, that in the judgment even of the preſent church of England, he, by his groſs miſrepreſentation of the uſages, does not diſcover a "want of knowledge and due fear of God," and "is not guilty of a wilful and damnable ſin." And in fine, let him ſhew, that all that Archbiſhops Laud and Wake, Biſhop Bull, Doctors Mede, Brevint, Scandaret, Johnſon, Bowyer, the author of the new Whole Duty of Man, *&c. &c.* eminent members of the Revolution church of England, have ſaid concerning the Euchariſtic oblation and invocation, *&c.* is nonſenſe and blaſphemy, and inconſiſtent with the doctrine of holy ſcripture.

2*dly*, With reſpect to Simony, let him ſhew, from plain texts of holy ſcripture, for nothing leſs will ſatisfy him anent the uſages, and nothing leſs will ſatisfy me in this caſe; let him by clear ſcripture proof ſhew, I ſay, that when Simon Magus aſked to have the power of conferring the Holy Ghoſt on whomſoever he ſhould lay his hands, he literally deſired *holy orders*. Let him ſhew farther, that λογῳ τουτῳ ſignifies the *ſpiritual gift*, as he tranſlates it, and that that ſpiritual gift can mean nothing elſe but *holy orders*. In a word, let him ſhew that though St Peter did not, and I may add, *could not*, give the impoſtor the power of communicating the Holy Ghoſt to others, becauſe he could not oblige the divine Spirit to deſcend when and how he pleaſed; yet

yet that our bleſſed Lord is not obliged to ratify an external commiſſion granted by his apoſtles in his name, although he has expreſsly promiſed to be with them to the end of the world, and conſequently, with their ſucceſſors in office. And to conclude this point, let him ſhew, that the canons of the church of England, publiſhed by Mr Johnſon, and the particular acts of Simony recorded by Mr Collier, are all forgeries to blacken the church of England, of which they were prieſts; and ſo, if the Rebuffer's doctrine be true, to diſgrace and degrade themſelves. Or elſe, let him ſhew that Simony is an innocent, harmleſs thing in England, and nowiſe affects the clerical character; but is only deſtructive, deadly, and damnable in poor old Scotland!

3*dly*, Let him ſhew, that the Scotch biſhops after the Revolution, (who he owns had valid orders), together with the Scots preſbyters and people, ceaſed to be a true part of Chriſt's church, merely for not complying with the Revolution, which their conſciences told them it was not lawful for them to do. Or, if this be too much to attempt, let him ſhew that ever there was a true part of Chriſt's church in any place, which had not ſpiritual juriſdiction, though not legal. Let him ſhew, that though there were no other biſhops in the world with whom the prieſts and people in Scotland, after the Revolution, believed they could in conſcience communicate, except the ejected biſhops, yet it was ſinful in them to acknowledge the authority of thoſe ejected biſhops: and conſequently, that although they actually ſubjected themſelves to them, yet thoſe biſhops acquired no right to govern them, or any right to ſpiritual juriſdiction.

And to conclude all, let him ſhew, from ſcripture and primitive antiquity, that ever there were biſhops in the Chriſtian world not dioceſans, except the college biſhops in Scotland, who pretended a right to govern any part of the church of Chriſt; and particularly, that they pretended to reduce a national church into the form of a ſingle dioceſe, and govern it in common; or if any who were not biſhops of particular diſtricts, but Utopian biſhops, or biſhops at large, ever did pretend to ſuch a right, let him ſhew, that ever that right was ſuſtained and acknowledged by any general council or common conſent of the Catholic church; or that it poſſibly could be acknowledged agreeable to the principles and diſcipline of the primitive church; the glorious pattern which all modern churches, and eſpecially the church of England, profeſs, and all ought to follow; but which few, alas! in reality do imitate. If he can do all this, it will be a proper introduction to his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; and the poor non-j —— muſt undoubtedly knock under; and, I think, ought to give way to his and his brethrens more hallowed miniſtrations,

ſtrations. But if he fails, and I ſtrongly ſuſpect he will fail, then it will appear that the non-j—— church is at leaſt a lawful church, if not the only lawful church in Scotland, and that the Rebuffer has not entered by the door into Chriſt's ſheep-fold, but is a climber up ſome other way: What epithet he deſerves, our Saviour will inform him, John x. i.

P. S. I. As the Rebuffer has been pleaſed to aſſume the character to himſelf of being a *generous* enemy, it is to be hoped he has not given reaſon to ſuſpect his being a *juſt* one: I mean, that ſince he has thought proper to inform the Engliſh biſhops, by his learned lucubrations, that the Scotch Epiſcopal clergy are clergymen only in name, but in reality ſacrilegious intruders into the divine offices, and at the ſame time the moſt *dangerous adverſaries the reformed religion and liturgy have to grapple with in Scotland*, it is to be hoped he has been ſo honeſt as to tranſmit to the ſame hands, what has hitherto appeared in their defence, or ſhall now, or at any time hereafter appear. For this the common principles of honour and juſtice demand of him; ſeeing, without that, they may be condemned unheard; which would ſurely be too hard a meaſure. And if he has done this, we are not very anxious about the conſequence. For however he may intend to inflame and irritate the church of England againſt the poor Epiſcopals in this country, there is no great danger that ſo learned and able a body of divines as they are, will be miſled by the vain ſophiſtry and falſe concluſions of ſo weak an advocate. There is no great danger that men of honour and principles will take offence at the attempts we have made to juſtify ourſelves upon eccleſiaſtical principles; becauſe ſelf-defence is the firſt law of nature, and not denied in this land of liberty to the greateſt miſcreants. Nor is it in the leaſt to be apprehended, that men of common ſenſe can either be made to believe, even by the boldeſt aſſertions, that clergymen who every day uſe the morning and evening ſervice of the Engliſh Prayer-book, and the offices for baptiſm, confirmation, matrimony, viſitation of the ſick, *&c.* occaſionally, are greater adverſaries to the reformed liturgy than either Papiſts or Preſbyterians, who uſe no part thereof, nay, many of whom deſpiſe and abhor it: or that they who inſtruct their young people in the church of England catechiſm, are the *greateſt enemies the reformed religion have to grapple with in Scotland*, even the Papiſts themſelves not excepted! *Riſum teneatis?*

II. The Rebuffer is ſo honeſt as to acknowledge, Rebuff, p. 107. that the uſages are not Popiſh errors, being *long* prior to Popery, properly ſo called: and wherefore then, I pray, all this noiſe and

and clamour againſt them? Why, ſays my learned antagoniſt, they are naturally ſubſervient to Popiſh purpoſes. But how can thoſe things be ſubſervient to Popiſh purpoſes, which are diametrically oppoſite to the groſſeſt errors of Popery, and which whoſoever believes, cannot poſſibly be a Papiſt? How, for example, can that perſon *worſhip ſaints*, who believes that even the higheſt ſaints, the bleſſed Virgin not excepted, are in a ſtate, though of happineſs, yet of imperfect happineſs, and may themſelves be benefited by the prayers of the church on earth? or how can he who believes all the *faithful* after death to be *happy*, though not completely ſo, believe in purgatory, which is a place of *miſery*, wherein the faithful are *tormented* with pains equal to the damned in degree, though not in duration? Finally, how can he believe that the ſacramental elements are tranſubſtantiated by the words of inſtitution, which is the Popiſh doctrine, who thinks the invocation of the Holy Spirit neceſſary *after* the words of inſtitution towards the complete conſecration, and even then believes that the elements remain in their natural ſubſtance? The worſhip of ſaints, purgatory, and tranſubſtantiation, are ſome of the groſſeſt Popiſh errors, flatly contradicted by the uſagers; and therefore to aſſert, with the Rebuffer, that they can be ſubſervient to Popiſh purpoſes, diſcovers the groſſeſt ignorance, or the greateſt degree of malice.

III. It ſhould have been obſerved, under the third remark upon the eighth canon of the firſt council of Nice, that the verb χειροτονέω (the participle of which in the firſt aoriſt paſſive, is there uſed with reſpect to the Novatians) is employed by that very council in four other different canons, and always to ſignify *ordination* or *conſecration*, and nothing elſe. Can. 4. three biſhops muſt χειροτονίαν ποιείσθαι, perform the *conſecration*; can. 15. ſhall be reſtored to the church in which ἐχειροτονήθη, he was *ordained* or *conſecrated*. Can. 16. If any biſhop ſhall ſurreptitiouſly receive one that belongs to another (church), and χειροτονήσαι, ſhall *ordain* or *conſecrate* him in his own church, let χειροτονία, the *ordination* be null; and ſo, can. 19. let them (the Paulianiſts) be rebaptized, and then, χειροτονεῖσθωσαν, let them be conſecrated or ordained. And now, after all this, when this great council expreſsly ſays of the Novatians, that χειροτονηθέντες, they were *ordained*, is it poſſible to believe that, in the judgement of thoſe fathers, they were no clergymen? is it poſſible to believe, that in this very canon wherein the word is uſed, they gave command that they ſhould be re-ordained?

IV. If it be poſſible, that, after what has been ſaid in this vindication, and obſerved by the Remarker in his letter from

Edinburgh, *anno* 1768, on the ſubject of Simony, any doubt yet remains with the reader concerning the effect of that crime, let him conſult the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury's charges to his clergy, and then chuſe whether he will believe the jurant-champion in Scotland, or the truly great and eminently learned Archbiſhop Secker. The Vindicator, it is true, has not had the good fortune to ſee thoſe charges; but he has reaſon to believe, on good authority, that at the ſame time that the reverend author not obſcurely hints at the too prevailing practice of Simony in the church of England, he clearly ſhews, that his notions of that crime are diametrically oppoſite to the Rebuffer's principles.

V. As another of the charitable gentlemen who have come down from England to aſſiſt us in our diſtreſs, has given out that Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh, and the other ante-revolution biſhops, left no ſucceſſors in their ſacred office, it is thought proper to ſhew the falſity and malice, and indeed the folly of this ridiculous aſſertion, by ſubjoining a liſt of the conſecrations in Scotland, from the Revolution down to our own times; the authenticity of which can be vouched by undoubted documents.

LIST of CONSECRATIONS made in SCOTLAND ſince the REVOLUTION, with the true Dates, and Conſecrators Names, as far as the preſent Biſhops are concerned.

January 25. 1705.

I. Mr John Sage, formerly one of the miniſters of Glaſgow, and Mr John Fullarton, formerly miniſter at Paiſley, were conſecrated at Edinburgh, by John Paterſon Archbiſhop of Glaſgow, Alexander Roſe Biſhop of Edinburgh, and Robert Douglas Biſhop of Dunblane.

April 28. 1709.

II. Mr John Falconar miniſter at Cairnbee, and Mr Henry Chryſtie miniſter at Kinroſs, were conſecrated at Dundee, by Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh, Biſhop Douglas of Dunblane, and Biſhop Sage.

Auguſt 25. 1711.

III. Mr Archibald Campbell preſbyter, was conſecrated at Dundee, by Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh, Biſhop Douglas of Dunblane, and Biſhop Falconar.

February 24. 1712.

IV. Mr James Gadderer, formerly miniſter at Kilmaurs, was conſecrated at London, by Biſhops Hickes, Falconar, and Campbell.

October 22. 1718.

V. Mr Arthur Millar, formerly miniſter at Inverеſk, and Mr William Irvine, formerly miniſter of Kirkmichael in Carrick, were conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh, Biſhop Fullarton, and Biſhop Falconar.

After the Biſhop of Edinburgh's death.

October 17. 1722.

VI. Mr Andrew Cant, formerly one of the miniſters of Edinburgh, and Mr David Freebairn, formerly miniſter at Dunning, were conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Fullarton, Millar, and Irvine.

June 4. 1727.

VII. Dr Thomas Rattray of Craighall was conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Gadderer, Millar, and Cant.

June 18. 1727.

VIII. Mr William Dunbar miniſter at Crudon, and Mr Robert Keith preſbyter in Edinburgh, were conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Gadderer, Millar, and Rattray.

June 14. 1735.

IX. Mr Robert White preſbyter at Cupar in Fife, was conſecrated at Carſebank near Forfar, by Biſhops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith.

From the above liſt, the validity of the orders of the preſent biſhops of Scotland is clear.—Other biſhops which have been conſecrated ſince the death of Biſhop Roſe of Edinburgh, with whom the preſent biſhops have no neceſſary connection, as their ſucceſſion does no wiſe depend upon them, were,

1724.

Mr Alexander Duncan, formerly miniſter of Kilpatrick-Eaſter, and Mr Robert Norie, miniſter at Dundee, were conſecrated by Biſhops Fullarton, Irvine, and Millar, at Edinburgh.

March 30. 1725.

Mr Henry Doughty, in St Anne's pariſh, Middleſex, formerly paſtor of Filiſingdales, Yorkſhire, and deprived *anno* 1690, was conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Fullarton, Millar, Irvine, and Freebairn.

November 29. 1726.

Mr James Roſe, in Cupar of Fife, formerly miniſter of Monimeal, and Mr John Ouchterlonie, formerly miniſter at Aberlemno, were conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Freebairn, Duncan, and Cant.

June 11. 1727.

Mr David Rankin, formerly miniſter at Bennathie, and Mr John Gillan, preſbyter in Edinburgh, were conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Freebairn, Duncan, Roſe, and Ouchterlonie.

November 2. 1727.

Mr Andrew Lumſden, formerly miniſter of Duddingſton, was conſecrated at Edinburgh, by Biſhops Rattray, Cant, and Keith.

ERRATA.

Page.	*line.*	
31.	15.	*for* is, *read*, being.
43.	11.	inſtead of, *that they were not all of us*, read, *that all they were not of us.*
48.	5.	*after this mark*, : *add*, and

BRITISH LIBRARY 30 OCT 68